```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
               FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
 2
 3
 4
    United States of America,
 5
                         Plaintiff,
                                   Criminal Action No. 3:17-cr-70
 6
    VS.
 7
    Reba Marcelle Myers,
 8
    Lisa Renee Lindquist,
 9
                         Defendants.
10
11
              Excerpt of proceedings had in the Jury Trial in the
12
    above-styled action on November 8, 2018, and November 9, 2018,
13
    before the Honorable Gina M. Groh, Chief Judge, at Martinsburg,
14
    West Virginia.
15
16
    APPEARANCES:
17
    On behalf of the United States of America:
              Michael D. Stein
18
              Assistant United States Attorney
19
              United States Attorney's Office
              P.O. Box 591
                             26003
20
              Wheeling, WV
21
              Christopher D. Jackson, Esq.
              United States Department of Justice
2.2
              1400 New York Avenue, NW
              Washington, DC 20005
23
24
    The Defendants were present in person.
25
    Proceedings reported by means of stenotype; transcript produced
    by official court reporter.
```

```
1
    APPEARANCES (Continued)
 2
 3
    On behalf of the Defendant, Reba Marcelle Myers:
 4
              Robert C. Stone, Jr., Esq.
 5
              Robert C. Stone Jr., PLLC
              529 West King Street
 6
              Martinsburg, WV 25401
 7
 8
    On behalf of the Defendant, Lisa Renee Lindquist:
 9
              Barry P. Beck, Esq.
              Nicholas J. Matzureff, Esq.
10
              Power, Beck & Matzureff Law Offices
              308 W. Burke Street
11
              Martinsburg, WV 25401
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

INDEX TO WITNESSES Page TESTIMONY OF JOHN FAIRCHILD Direct Examination by Mr. Stein Cross Examination by Mr. Stone Cross Examination by Mr. Beck Redirect Examination by Mr. Stein

4

1 (The following are excerpts from the trial proceedings held 11/8/2018 and 11/9/2018.) 2 3 4 (11/8/2018, 11:56 A.M. Defendants and their counsel are present, Government's counsel are present; and the jury is 5 6 present.) 7 THE COURT: Next witness. 8 9 MR. STEIN: The United States calls John Fairchild. 10 THE COURT: We're going to go until about 12:30 with 11 his testimony, and then we're going to break for lunch. 12 (The witness was sworn in.) 13 THE CLERK: You may have a seat in the witness chair 14 and please watch your step. 15 THE COURT: You may proceed, Mr. Stein. 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. STEIN: 18 Please introduce yourself to the jury. 19 My name is John Fairchild. Α. 20 And where do you live, Mr. Fairchild? Q. 21 248 Bay Avenue, Patchoque, New York 11772. 2.2 And have -- how long have you lived in the New York 23 area? 24 A. My whole life. 25 Q. Have you been convicted of trafficking in Virginia-only

1 | taxed cigarettes?

- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And were you purchasing those cigarettes in the Winchester,
- 4 | Frederick County area?
- 5 A. Yes, I was.
- 6 | Q. What was your favorite distributor of contraband-quantity
- 7 | cigarettes?
- 8 A. Dollar Stretcher.
- 9 $\|$ Q. And did you -- who -- did you -- who did you regularly deal
- 10 | with?
- 11 A. Reba and Lisa.
- 12 Q. Was that in person or otherwise?
- 13 A. Sometimes in person and sometimes otherwise.
- 14 Q. And how would the otherwise dealings be?
- 15 A. Some people that would go down there and get them for me
- 16 | would deal with them.
- 17 $\|$ Q. Would you also deal sometimes by -- with the store either
- 18 by telephone or text messaging?
- 19 A. There was some text correspondence.
- 20 Q. How often when you were doing it did you travel to
- 21 Winchester, Virginia and the Dollar Stretcher store?
- 22 A. Weekly.
- 23 | Q. And you said that you dealt with the owner, Reba; is that
- 24 | right?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. And would you -- is she in the courtroom?
- $2 \parallel A$. Yes, she is.
- 3 \parallel Q. Would you point her out and describe an article of
- 4 clothing.
- 5 A. She's sitting next to the gentleman with the purple tie and
- 6 some glasses on her head.
- 7 MR. STEIN: May the record reflect that the witness
- 8 has identified Defendant Myers?
- 9 THE COURT: The record will so reflect.
- 10 BY MR. STEIN:
- 11 Q. And the person that you referred to as Lisa, is she in the
- 12 | courtroom?
- 13 A. Yes, she is.
- 14 Q. Would you point her out and describe an article of
- 15 clothing.
- 16 A. She's sitting on the left over here in the middle of these
- 17 | two gentlemen with the glasses on.
- 18 MR. STEIN: May the record reflect that the witness
- 19 | has identified Defendant Lindquist?
- 20 THE COURT: The record will so reflect.
- 21 BY MR. STEIN:
- 22 | Q. How -- you said you regularly dealt with them. What does
- 23 | regularly mean to you?
- 24 A. Once or twice a week.
- 25 Q. And on those once or twice a week, about what percentage of

the time would one or the other have taken care of you?

- 2 A. Ninety percent of the time.
- $3 \parallel Q$. And out of that 90 percent of the time, on the overlap
- 4 | about what percent would they both be there?
- 5 A. Like 75 percent.
- 6 Q. And on other occasions, do you remember who you would deal
- 7 | with at the Dollar Stretcher?
- 8 A. Once in a while somebody else that was working that day or
- 9 night.
- 10 Q. Do you remember any names?
- 11 A. Joy and that's about it.
- 12 Q. How did you usually pay?
- 13 A. Cash most of the time.
- 14 Q. And I take it that some of the time a different way?
- 15 A. Sometimes I would use a credit card or a debit card.
- 16 || Q. Let me show you what has been marked as Exhibit 44. And
- 17 | what is Exhibit 44?
- 18 A. It's a statement of my credit card.
- 19 \mathbb{Q} . And when was the bill of that credit card due?
- 20 A. January 1, 2013.
- MR. STEIN: I would offer Exhibit 44.
- MR. STONE: No objection.
- 23 MR. BECK: No objection, Your Honor.
- 24 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 25 (Government's Exhibit No. 44 was admitted.)

1 BY MR. STEIN:

- $2 \parallel Q$. Would you look at page 2. And do you see two purchases on
- 3 November 11th, one below the other?
- 4 | A. Yes, I do.
- 5 Q. And where were those purchases?
- 6 A. Dollar Stretcher.
- $7 \parallel Q$. And the first purchase, the top one of those two, how much
- 8 | is that for?
- 9 A. \$243.86.
- 10 | Q. And what did you purchase for that amount of money?
- 11 A. Five cartons of cigarettes.
- 12 $\|$ Q. And the purchase immediately below that, how much is that
- 13 | for?
- 14 A. 1,299.38.
- 15 Q. And how many cartons is that approximately?
- 16 A. Twenty-five.
- 17 $\|$ Q. And so the total price was 25. Is that consistent with 30
- 18 | cartons?
- 19 A. Yes. Well, it's also consistent with the way they would
- 20 sell them.
- 21 Q. Well, I think we've gone through that so we'll just move
- 22 on.
- 23 Did Ms. Myers and Ms. Lindquist know that you were from New
- 24 York?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. And how do you know they knew that?
- $2 \parallel A$. When I talk, they notice my accent.
- 3 Q. Anything else?
- $4 \parallel A$. Yeah. We -- you know, have a safe trip back home.
- 5 0. Did --
- 6 MR. STEIN: Would you put Exhibit 78-E on the screen,
- 7 please.
- 8 BY MR. STEIN:
- 9 Q. And do you recognize that text message?
- 10 A. Yes, I do.
- 11 Q. And why don't you read it.
- 12 A. "Hi, Joy. It's John. Please let Reba know this is her
- 13 | winning New York Powerball ticket."
- 14 Q. And what is that all about?
- 15 A. She'd given me money to buy a Powerball ticket in New York.
- 16 || Q. When -- on all those trips to Dollar Stretcher, did you
- 17 | think -- did you see other traffickers also at that store
- 18 | buying contraband quantities of cigarettes?
- 19 A. Yes, I saw some other people.
- 20 Q. Did you recognize them as people that you had seen there
- 21 | and at other places purchasing contraband quantities of
- 22 | cigarettes?
- 23 \parallel A. Yeah. I would recognize them in the car.
- $24 \mid Q$. And would there be anything distinctive about the car?
- 25 A. Out-of-state plates.

1 And where did you sell the Virginia-only tax cigarettes that you purchased at the Dollar Stretcher? 2 3 A. I sold them on my coffee trucks in New York. 4 MR. STEIN: May I approach? 5 THE COURT: Yes, sir. BY MR. STEIN: 6 7 Let me show you Exhibit 39. And let me retrieve that and let me -- this has been admitted. 8 Without going into detail, what is Exhibit 39? 9 It's me giving cigarettes to a coffee truck that I do 10 11 business with. 12 Q. Okay. MR. STEIN: I would offer Exhibit 39. 13 MR. STONE: No objection. 14 15 MR. BECK: No objection, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Admitted. 17 (Government's Exhibit No. 39 was admitted.) BY MR. STEIN: 18 19 And where are you in that photograph? I'm at the trunk of that vehicle with a bag of cigarettes. 20 Α. 21 And what is behind you? Q. 2.2 A coffee truck. Α. 23 Q. And is this where the distribution is taking place? 24 Yes. Α.

When you traveled back from Winchester to New York with the

- 1 contraband cigarettes, what route did you take at least for the
- 2 | first maybe hundred miles?
- 3 A. I would travel north on 81 to 78 East.
- 4 | Q. So north -- would you travel through West Virginia that
- 5 way?
- 6 A. West Virginia would be the first state I went through.
- $7 \parallel Q$. About how long did it take you to make that drive?
- 8 A. It was about six hours to get home.
- 9 Q. And how many hours did it take to get there?
- 10 A. About five hours.
- 11 Q. And why the difference?
- 12 A. Traffic on the way back and getting over the bridges.
- 13 Q. So before you made that five-hour drive, would you just
- 14 make that drive and hope they would have cigarettes or what
- 15 | would you do?
- 16 $\|$ A. No. It was understood that I was coming to pick up
- 17 | cigarettes.
- 18 | Q. Would -- and was your practice -- how -- what was your
- 19 practice to let them know what you were doing?
- 20 A. We had a standard order. I would text it sometimes.
- 21 Q. And who would the orders be texted to?
- 22 A. Reba.
- 23 $\|$ Q. And let me show you exhibit --
- 24 MR. STEIN: Would you put Exhibit 4-B on the screen,
- 25 please.

- 1 BY MR. STEIN:
- 2 Q. Does that -- these are text messages that were downloaded
- 3 | from Defendant Myers' phone. Do you see your phone number as
- 4 | being the sender of a substantial number of these texts?
- 5 A. Yes, I do.
- 6 Q. And what is that phone number?
- 7 A. 631-855-5526.
- $8 \parallel Q$. And why don't you look at the top order on the screen. And
- 9 what is that?
- 10 A. It's a text order for cigarettes. 15 Marlboro Lights, 15
- 11 Marlboro, 15 Newports, and 5 Parliament.
- 12 Q. And was that at that time your standard order?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And what was your actual practice in terms of -- you said
- 15 you went two times a week. What were the days that you would
- 16 | travel?
- 17 A. Most of the time on Sunday and Wednesday.
- 18 Q. What would you purchase on Wednesdays?
- 19 A. I would get 50 of them.
- 20 $\|$ Q. And why -- and what would you -- what would you buy on
- 21 | Sundays?
- 22 A. Usually a hundred.
- 23 | Q. And when you would buy the cigarettes from Dollar Stretcher
- 24 and sell them in New York, would you use the money or a portion
- 25 of the money from the sale to buy the next round of cigarettes

- from Dollar Stretcher?
- 2 A. Yes, I would.
- 3 $\|$ Q. And look at the first order on 10/20. And what did you
- 4 order there?
- 5 A. Fifteen Marlboros, fifteen Marlboro Lights, fifteen
- 6 Newports, and five Parliaments.
- 7 Q. And about five seconds later, you corrected that order?
- 8 A. I asked to double that order.
- 9 Q. And why was that?
- 10 A. It was a Sunday.
- 11 Q. When you look at exhibit -- oh. And look on -- at the
- 12 orders on July 25th.
- 13 | A. Uh-huh.
- 14 \mathbb{Q} . And is that your standard 50-carton order for then?
- 15 A. Yes, it is.
- 16 Q. And, specifically, who did you send that text message to to
- 17 | make that order?
- 18 A. Reba.
- 19 \mathbb{Q} . And again on the 7/28/2013 50-carton order, who did you
- 20 | text message that order to?
- 21 A. Reba.
- 22 0. And were those orders filled?
- 23 A. Yes, they were.
- 24 \mathbb{Q} . And the 7/31 50-carton order, who was that texted to?
- 25 A. Reba.

- 1 \mathbb{Q} . The 8/14/2013 50-carton order, who was that text message
- 2 to?
- 3 A. Reba.
- 4 \mathbb{Q} . The September 11, 2013, 50-carton order, who was that text
- 5 message to?
- 6 A. Reba.
- 7 $\|$ Q. The 10/16 50-carton order, who was that texted to?
- 8 A. Reba.
- 9 Q. And were all of these orders delivered to you when you
- 10 drove to Virginia?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And did you drive them all back through West Virginia to
- 13 New York?
- 14 A. I can't remember.
- 15 Q. Well, what was your route from --
- 16 A. They were definitely driven back to New York.
- 17 \mathbb{Q} . And what was --
- 18 A. I believe Dennis was picking them up though.
- 19 Q. Oh. Do you know what Dennis' route was?
- 20 A. Yeah.
- 21 Q. And what was Dennis' route?
- 22 \parallel A. Dennis' route was to drive up 81 North, and he would call
- 23 me when he got to Pennsylvania.
- $24 \parallel Q$. Well, as you brought up Dennis, my question is did you have
- 25 runners working for you?

- 1 A. I did.
- 2 Q. Who was your first runner?
- 3 A. Adam.
- 4 | Q. Look at --
- 5 MR. STEIN: Put up 78-A on the screen, please.
- 6 BY MR. STEIN:
- 7 Q. And how did you communicate with Adam?
- 8 A. By text.
- 9 Q. And on the -- is 78-A a text from you to Adam?
- 10 A. Yes, it is.
- 11 | Q. And do you give him some instructions?
- 12 A. Yes, I do.
- 13 Q. And what did you tell him to do?
- 14 A. Call Reba and order 125 Newport, 10 Newport 100s, 10
- 15 Newport Light, 40 Parliament, 5 Marlboro Menthol, 5 Kool box, 5
- 16 Newport Light 100. Need to pick up tomorrow.
- 17 Q. And how many cartons of cigarettes were you telling Adam to
- 18 order and having called Reba?
- 19 A. There's 190 in that order.
- 20 Q. Really?
- 21 | A. Wait a minute. Sorry. I misadded. There's 200 in that
- 22 order.
- 23 | Q. Okay. Would you look at Exhibit 78-B.
- MR. STEIN: Would you put that on the screen,
- 25 please.

- 1 BY MR. STEIN:
- 2 Q. And what is that?
- 3 A. That's another text to Adam.
- $4 \parallel Q$. And do you give him any instructions on that?
- 5 A. Yes. Call Reba. Order 135 Newports, 10 Newport 100s, 10
- 6 Newport Light, 10 Marlboro Menthol, 5 Kool box, 5 Newport Light
- 7 | 100, 10 Parliament 100, 5 Marlboro Medium, 5 Marlboro soft.
- 8 | Need Wednesday.
- 9 \mathbb{Q} . And did he follow your instructions?
- 10 A. Yes, he did.
- 11 || Q. Would you look at Exhibit 78-C. And what instructions did
- 12 | you direct your runner, Adam, to do this time?
- 13 A. Text Reba, please, and order 98 Newport.
- 14 Q. And how did he respond?
- 15 A. That he set it up. Ninety-eight green for Thursday.
- 16 Q. What does green refer to?
- 17 A. Green is Newports.
- 18 Q. Now, let's switch over now from Adam and talk about
- 19 | Dennis O'Connell who you have already said was one of your
- 20 | runners. How did his relationship with Defendant Myers
- 21 start?
- 22 A. I brought him on a trip and introduced him.
- 23 Q. Approximately when was that?
- 24 A. Many years ago. 2011. I don't know exactly.
- 25 || Q. All right. Would about the winter of 2012 be a ballpark?

- 1 A. Yeah. It's probably right. If Adam was in 2011, then
- 2 Dennis was a little bit after him so that makes sense.
- 3 \parallel Q. All right. I would like you to look at Exhibit 15 which is
- 4 going to be on the screen. And what is that?
- 5 A. That's a rental receipt with my name on it.
- 6 Q. And --
- $7 \parallel A$. My rental car.
- 8 Q. And who do you make -- who is the rental from?
- 9 A. Hertz.
- 10 | Q. Were you a regular customer?
- 11 A. Yes, I was.
- 12 Q. And what kind of business relationship did you have with
- 13 | that Hertz rental facility?
- 14 A. A very good one.
- 15 Q. Did they -- what kind of prices did they give you?
- 16 $\|$ A. They gave me the lowest price they could give me, and they
- 17 | always had a car there for me when I needed it.
- 18 $\|$ Q. And the car that was leased in this transaction, what kind
- 19 of car was it?
- 20 | A. A 2013 Mercedes.
- 21 \mathbb{Q} . And what was the purpose of the rental?
- 22 A. For Dennis to drive up and get cigarettes.
- 23 | Q. Did you think it was a good idea at the time to have Dennis
- 24 drive to make a contraband cigarette run in a Mercedes?
- 25 A. No, I did not.

1 So what happened? Q. It was the only vehicle they had. 2 Α. 3 And --Q. 4 I needed a vehicle. Α. Okay. And what was the date of the rental? 5 Q. December 4, 2013. 6 Α. 7 And Dennis -- you delivered it to Dennis? Yes. 8 Α. 9 And sent him off to Virginia to buy cigarettes? 10 Yes, I did. Α. 11 Did he bring any back? Q. 12 Not that trip. Α. 13 Q. Why not? 14 He got pulled over and the cigarettes were taken away. 15 MR. STEIN: I have no further questions. 16 Mr. Fairchild, do you have any exhibits up there with 17 you? 18 THE WITNESS: I do. Thirty-nine. 19 MR. STEIN: I will retrieve it. 20 THE COURT: Mr. Stone, are you going to be a while with this cross? 21 2.2 MR. STONE: Probably, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Then this a good point to break, 23 24 ladies and gentlemen. We'll take a lunch break. It's 20 after 2.5 12:00. Let's get back here about 1:50 ready to start.

```
1
    Remember --
                          I'm sorry. Did you say 1:15?
 2
              MR. STEIN:
 3
              THE COURT:
                          1:50.
 4
              MR. STEIN: 1:50.
 5
              THE COURT: That will give us about an hour and 20
   minutes or so to an hour and a half actually. So, yeah.
 6
 7
    after 12:00. Yeah, 1:50 we'll get back on the record, ladies
 8
    and gentlemen.
 9
              Keep your minds free and open of the ultimate
10
    outcome. Don't discuss the case among yourselves.
11
        (The jury was excused from the courtroom at 12:22 P.M.)
12
              THE COURT: Please be seated, everyone.
13
              Mr. Fairchild, you're in the middle of your
14
    testimony. You need to be back here by 10 minutes to 2:00.
15
    Remember since you're basically on the stand, even though you
16
    step off for lunch, you can't discuss your case with anyone or
17
    your testimony with anyone. Okay?
18
              THE WITNESS: Okay.
19
              THE COURT: All right. You're excused, sir.
20
              THE WITNESS: Thank you.
21
              (Witness excused.)
2.2
              THE COURT: Anything, counsel, before we take our
23
    break?
24
              MR. STEIN: No, Your Honor.
25
              MR. STONE: No, Your Honor.
```

```
1
             MR. BECK: No, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: All right, folks.
 2
 3
              (Recess 12:23 P.M. - 1:52 P.M.)
 4
              THE COURT: Please be seated, everyone. We're all
   back in attendance except for Mr. Jackson. Is he going to be
 5
 6
   here momentarily?
 7
             MR. STEIN: Yes, Your Honor. There he is.
              THE COURT: All right. Should we bring our jury
 8
 9
   out?
10
             MR. STEIN: Yes, Your Honor.
11
             MR. STONE: Yes, Your Honor.
12
             MR. BECK: Yes, Your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: All right. Okay. We'll bring our jury
14
   out.
15
              Is Mr. Fairchild out in the wings somewhere? Okay.
16
   Come on up, Mr. Fairchild. You can go ahead and get back up on
17
   the stand while we're waiting. All right.
18
        (The jury returned to open court.)
19
              THE COURT: Please be seated, everyone. Welcome
20
   back, ladies and gentlemen. Are we ready to proceed? All
21
   right.
22
             Mr. Fairchild, remember you're still under oath.
23
              THE WITNESS: Yes.
24
              THE COURT: Mr. Stone.
25
             MR. STONE: Thank you, Your Honor.
```

CROSS EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. STONE:

- 3 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Fairchild. I'm Robert Stone. I
- 4 | represent Reba Myers. You -- Mr. Stein asked you about your
- 5 cigarette business and how you got involved in it, and you
- 6 mentioned food trucks. So what exactly was your food truck
- 7 | operation?
- 8 A. The food trucks on Long Island cater to different
- 9 businesses on Long Island. So they bring them breakfast and
- 10 | lunch and other items such as cigarettes, Red Bull, gum. So
- 11 | basically it's a deli on wheels.
- 12 Q. And do you -- now, you indicated you supplied food trucks,
- 13 | but did you actually own a few food trucks yourself?
- 14 A. Yes, I did. I have over the years. Currently, I own two
- 15 of them right now.
- 16 | Q. All right. So during the time period that you were
- 17 | involved in the cigarette trafficking, how many trucks did you
- 18 have?
- 19 $\|$ A. At one point up to -- on my own never more than two and
- 20 then partnerships in a few of them.
- 21 | Q. All right. And so your typical food truck, how -- I mean
- 22 how many cartons or packs of cigarettes would you outfit a food
- 23 | truck with?
- 24 A. It depends on the volume. You know, they would just come
- 25 | to me. And if they needed five, they would buy five. If they

- 1 needed ten, they would buy ten.
- 2 Q. So --
- $3 \parallel A$. I mean on average -- on average, they bought maybe three or
- 4 | four a week.
- 5 Q. All right. So each food truck operator?
- 6 A. Yes.
- $7 \parallel Q$. And how many food truck operators do you think that you
- 8 | supplied?
- 9 A. I had about 40 of them.
- 10 Q. All right. And then -- you're not the only person buying
- 11 cigarettes down south or in Virginia and taking them back north
- 12 | into New York or other states; right?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. I mean are there -- do you have competitors --
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. -- in your business where you're at?
- 17 | A. No, I don't.
- 18 | Q. So you pretty much you ran the show in the area?
- 19 A. Yeah. My nickname is Johnny Cigs (spelled phonetically).
- 20 | Q. All right. So it's not Johnny Smoke, it's Johnny Cigs?
- 21 A. Johnny Cigs.
- 22 | Q. Okay. So you had -- I mean did you have a specific
- 23 | territory in Suffolk County or --
- 24 A. It wasn't a territory. I would just meet the trucks in the
- 25 morning and sell them cigarettes.

- 1 Q. All right. Now, did you -- out on Long Island, you -- I
- 2 guess is one of the boroughs or two of the boroughs on Long
- 3 | Island, and then you go out to -- what is it, Nassau County and
- 4 | Suffolk County?
- 5 A. Well, Long Island has two counties. Suffolk County and
- 6 Nassau County. The boroughs is the city and that's a
- 7 different -- different -- you know, there's five boroughs in
- 8 | the city --
- 9 Q. Okay.
- 10 A. -- but I lived in Suffolk County, New York.
- 11 Q. All right. And is that the only county in which you
- 12 | distributed your cigarettes?
- 13 A. Yes, it was.
- 14 Q. Now, what -- if you're supplying cigarettes to another
- 15 operator, what are you charging them for a case of cigarettes?
- 16 A. Over the years, it had gone up. On average, we'd
- 17 | started -- I mean dependent on what I paid in Virginia, I would
- 18 wholesale it. It was a wholesale business.
- 19 0. Uh-huh.
- 20 A. So --
- 21 \parallel Q. So what -- I mean if you're buying --
- 22 A. My last carton I sold, I got \$68 for it.
- 23 | Q. All right. So --
- 24 A. A carton of cigarettes.
- 25 Q. And that would have been in what, November 2017?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. And so you're buying -- whatever you're buying them for in
- 3 | Virginia --
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. I mean let's say you bought a carton for 50 bucks in
- 6 November 2017.
- $7 \parallel A$. It was probably a little higher than that.
- 8 Q. So 60 bucks?
- 9 \parallel A. In between 50 and 60. Probably mid -- 55, 56.
- 10 | Q. So you're making -- when you sell the cigarettes by the
- 11 carton, you may make 10 or 12 bucks a carton?
- 12 A. Yes. On average.
- 13 Q. All right. And then that doesn't include whatever you had
- 14 to pay to get to Virginia and then get back to New York; right?
- 15 A. No, it doesn't.
- 16 | Q. All right. And with what you were doing -- I mean you had
- 17 | a nickname. Apparently, you're well known in your area. Were
- 18 the local police, were they harassing you? Were they coming by
- 19 | trying to shut you down as far as you --
- 20 A. No.
- 21 | Q. -- resupplying the trucks?
- 22 A. No.
- 23 | Q. Now, your customers, the people who were buying off of your
- 24 | truck, would they question the cigarettes that were being sold
- 25 and say, hey, you know, there's no New York tax stamps on

- 1 | these; I can't take these?
- 2 A. They knew they were from Virginia. They often said they
- 3 | taste better. They're fresher.
- 4 | Q. All right. So nobody -- at least the people who are
- 5 working at the job sites and out in the public --
- 6 A. They noticed too. Everybody looks at the tax stamp.
- $7 \parallel Q$. But did they have any issue or problem about buying the
- 8 | cigarettes?
- 9 A. They would buy them. They might make a snicker like you're
- 10 getting them very cheap. Why are you selling them so high?
- 11 Q. So what were you charging off the truck?
- 12 A. The customers are buying. They set their price. What they
- 13 | would charge.
- 14 Q. What about your trucks?
- 15 A. My trucks would get \$10 a pack.
- 16 Q. So you're -- each carton has got 20 packs; right? No, ten
- 17 packs.
- 18 A. Ten packs.
- 19 Q. Ten packs in a carton. Fifty-five bucks a carton for you.
- 20 | So you go up the road, and you're selling your 10 packs of
- 21 | cigarettes for \$10 apiece. So you're making \$100. Off of the
- 22 ones you sold, you're making \$45?
- 23 A. Yeah. The three or four cartons on the one truck I would
- 24 make.
- 25 | Q. So for you it's better if your truck sells them as opposed

- 1 | to selling them to someone else on their truck?
- 2 A. Well, that would be the retail business. And retail is
- 3 | always better than wholesale.
- 4 Q. All right. Now, did any -- in the county or Suffolk
- 5 | County, I mean I presume that they have some kind of county
- 6 officers that come and inspect the trucks or inspect businesses
- 7 | just to make sure you're complying with all the local rules and
- 8 regulations. Is that something that would happen?
- 9 A. The Board of Health issues licenses once a year.
- 10 | Q. All right. I mean are you subject to any kind of
- 11 | inspections or anything?
- 12 A. Yeah. They check the oven temperature and the side
- 13 | temperature to make sure that if we are selling any hot food or
- 14 cold food that it meets certain Board of Health regulations.
- 15 Q. All right. Did you ever have anybody from the Board of
- 16 | Health or the county show up and say, you know, we've got a
- 17 | problem with this truck; you got these cigarettes on it?
- 18 A. No, they didn't.
- 19 $\|$ Q. So your business -- you mentioned that the last cartons of
- 20 cigarettes that you were selling would have been November of
- 21 | 2017; is that correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. And do you agree that the Dollar Stretcher store closed
- 24 around the end of August, beginning of September 2015?
- 25 A. Yes. That sounds about accurate.

- 1 Q. All right. And based upon your testimony, your business
- 2 | continued until November 2017?
- 3 A. That's correct.
- $4 \parallel Q$. All right. So you would agree that the Dollar Stretcher
- 5 store was not indispensable to your business?
- 6 A. No, it wasn't. It made it harder to get them.
- 7 Q. All right. Now, in Winchester or Frederick County,
- 8 | Virginia, you purchased cigarettes from numerous stores; is
- 9 | that correct?
- 10 A. Yes. I purchased from several stores in that area.
- 11 Q. All right. Can you give us some examples of some other
- 12 | retail stores from whom you would purchase cigarettes?
- 13 A. The gas stations in the area. You know, my main motivation
- 14 was price.
- 15 Q. Okay. So --
- 16 A. And then, you know, quantity. Some of them were very
- 17 | strict on Newports whereas Dollar Stretcher would sell you
- 18 | however many Newports you wanted.
- 19 Q. All right. So where Dollar Stretcher closed August,
- 20 | September 2015, your operation continued until November 2017.
- 21 Where were you buying your cigarettes?
- 22 A. I would get them from the Discount Outlet, Sheetz gas
- 23 station, the Exxon, the Dollar Saver.
- 24 | Q. So the Dollar Saver is a store separate from Dollar
- 25 | Stretcher?

- 1 A. Yes, it is.
- 2 Q. And -- but that's still in Frederick County, Virginia?
- 3 A. Yes, it is.
- 4 Q. And would you -- you went to Sheetz. Did you go to the
- 5 same Sheetz? Did you go to multiple Sheetz --
- 6 A. You could --
- 7 | Q. -- stores?
- $8 \parallel A$. You could only buy five cartons at those establishments.
- 9 Q. All right. So now at Sheetz --
- 10 A. There's a limit.
- 11 | Q. Now at Sheetz, you walk in, you buy five; right?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 | O. You walk out?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. You walk right back in, you can buy five more?
- 16 A. No, you cannot.
- 17 Q. Really?
- 18 A. Really.
- 19 Q. So that's your sworn testimony?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. And so you've never --
- 22 A. You cannot.
- 23 | Q. You've never bought five cartons at Sheetz, walked out to
- 24 | your vehicle, and walked right back in and buy five more?
- 25 A. No.

- 1 Q. Never?
- 2 A. Because at Sheetz in 2017 you can't do that.
- 3 $\|$ Q. Well, I'm -- we're talking about the time period of the
- 4 | indictment, 2015, 2014, 2013.
- 5 A. No, you can't do that. Exxon would only sell you 25.
- 6 \parallel Sheetz would only sell you five. Dollar Saver would sell you
- 7 | five Marlboros and five Newports, and then they would sell you
- 8 | a different -- like maybe an American Spirit. But they would
- 9 only sell five of Newports and five Marlboros.
- 10 Q. All right. Now, Mr. Fairchild, I mean I understand you got
- 11 | a lot riding on this testimony today; right?
- 12 A. What do you mean by that?
- 13 Q. Well, you -- let's talk about this case. You got indicted
- 14 October 3, 2017; is that correct?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. And you knew beforehand that you were going to be indicted;
- 17 | is that correct?
- 18 A. Yes. Homeland Security came to my house and told me of the
- 19 | indictment.
- 20 Q. All right. And when you went to court to be arraigned on
- 21 | your indictment, you were released on bail; correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. And your pretrial release conditions that you signed
- 24 | included provisions that you not violate the law; correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 | Q. And so contrary to the terms and conditions of your
- 2 | pretrial release -- which you're still on; right?
- 3 A. Yes, I am.
- 4 Q. You actually continued to engage in cigarette trafficking,
- 5 and you continued to travel from New York to Virginia, and you
- 6 continued to buy large quantities of cigarettes at least once,
- 7 | maybe twice a week; correct?
- 8 A. No. Actually --
- 9 Q. Remember you're under oath.
- 10 A. Yeah, I do remember I'm under oath; but I'm just thinking
- 11 about the times. By that time -- no, I believe it was only in
- 12 October, and then it ended in November. There was only three
- 13 | times.
- 14 Q. There was only three times?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 $\|$ Q. Okay. In actuality, on the day that you signed your plea
- 17 | agreement, November 29, 2017, you'd actually been stopped by
- 18 | law enforcement in West Virginia with a carload of cigarettes;
- 19 | correct?
- 20 A. That was the third time.
- 21 | Q. All right. So you're on -- you've been indicted. You're
- 22 on pretrial release. You get stopped almost seven weeks after
- 23 | you've been indicted, after you've been arraigned, and you're
- 24 still engaging in buying cigarettes and driving them north to
- 25 New York?

- 1 A. Yes.
- $2 \parallel Q$. And notwithstanding the fact that you were still engaging
- 3 | in criminal conduct, blatantly violating the terms and
- 4 conditions of your bail. You had a meeting the night you got
- 5 | arrested at the state police barracks; correct?
- 6 A. When they brought me in, I was arrested. I guess that's a
- 7 meeting.
- 8 Q. And you had a meeting with your lawyer, Mr. Stein, and
- 9 Deputy Ellinger; correct?
- 10 A. They were there.
- 11 Q. All right. And you actually signed a plea agreement with
- 12 | the Government; correct?
- 13 A. Yes, I did.
- 14 Q. And Mr. Stein and apparently probation -- I mean nobody
- 15 moved to revoke your pretrial release; right?
- 16 A. No, they didn't.
- 17 Q. So even though you were committing crimes, continuing --
- 18 continuing to traffic in cigarettes, you didn't get your bail
- 19 revoked?
- 20 $\|$ A. My entire life I have always been at a disadvantage, and
- 21 | I've taken chances. And this was another time that I took a
- 22 chance, and the cards fell where they did. And I'm here today
- 23 | to make amends for that and to move on with my life in a
- 24 different direction.
- 25 Q. All right. So before you got indicted, did you have any

- 1 | idea that your cell phone calls were being wiretapped by the
- 2 authorities in Suffolk County?
- 3 \parallel A. No. I found out that -- November 29th I found that out.
- 4 Q. All right. So you had no idea that at the time, the
- 5 authorities of New York basically could listen to everything
- 6 going out and everything coming in?
- 7 A. I had no idea about that.
- 8 Q. And did you -- but you subsequently found out; right?
- 9 A. I sure did.
- 10 $\|$ Q. All right. And would you agree that when you found out
- 11 | that Mr. O'Connell was going to come give a deposition that you
- 12 | were extremely worried?
- 13 A. That was before November 29th.
- 14 | Q. Well, I'm just asking you. You were extremely worried that
- 15 he was going to --
- 16 A. Well, I knew he was gonna, yeah. I wasn't extremely
- 17 | worried. I just preferred he didn't.
- 18 Q. All right. I mean did you -- you engaged in these
- 19 conversations with people you knew saying that, you know,
- 20 | O'Connell is a rat. I can't believe he's going to talk about
- 21 me. I mean that -- constantly; correct?
- 22 A. I had mentioned to a couple of people because they knew him
- 23 | personally so they used to buy cigarettes from him that he
- 24 | would get from me.
- 25 Q. You actually contacted his -- is it his nephew, John?

- 1 A. His nephew, John O'Connell, had actually begged me to give
- 2 | his uncle a job --
- 3 Q. Uh-huh.
- 4 A. -- several years ago. And that's how Dennis and I started
- 5 to work together.
- 6 | Q. All right. You actually contacted his nephew, John, looks
- 7 | like October 4, 2017. Do you recall calling him and suggesting
- 8 | that his uncle on the morning of the deposition act as if he
- 9 was having a medical problem and call for an ambulance so he
- 10 could avoid having to appear for the deposition?
- 11 A. To his nephew?
- 12 Q. Yeah.
- 13 A. Yeah. Him and I spoke. I guess if that's --
- 14 Q. I'm asking you. I mean didn't you say that to him? Didn't
- 15 | you suggest you wanted some way --
- 16 A. I had said to John -- I had said, you know, if you can't
- 17 make it to court, yeah. I mean he's a very sick man.
- 18 Q. Uh-huh.
- 19 A. And with my limited legal expertise, in my mind, I thought
- 20 that would be sufficient for him to get out of giving the
- 21 | testimony.
- 22 Q. All right. So you suggested that Mr. O'Connell's nephew
- 23 | tell his uncle, "Act as if you're sick; call an ambulance; and
- 24 | then that way, you won't have to appear for your deposition"?
- 25 A. Considering that John, his nephew, was the individual that

came to me many years ago and asked me if Dennis could work for 2 me. 3 Q. Uh-huh. 4 A. And at that time, he was too sick to run a food truck. the only thing that I had going on was a trip to Virginia that 5 he could do. So when --6 7 So you felt like he owed it to you? No, I didn't feel like he owed it to me --8 9 MR. STEIN: Your Honor, I object to him interrupting the witness's answer. 10 11 THE COURT: Mr. Stone. 12 MR. STONE: No problem, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right. MR. STONE: He can say whatever he wants. 14 15 THE COURT: Sustained. 16 John and I have been friends since elementary school. John 17 and his family used to drive me to school when I didn't have a 18 mother or father to take me to school. And so John and I go 19 way way back. So when John had asked me to hire his uncle, I 20 hired him. And so I called John as the same friend that would 21 drive me to school when I couldn't get to high school. And I 22 was just -- like I said, my legal expertise, I was hoping there 23 was some way for me to get out of this. 24 So you actually were hoping there was some way that your

friend could intervene and try to obstruct the Government's

- 1 | investigation?
- 2 \parallel A. No. I was just hoping that -- I -- that's not what I was
- 3 | hoping. I was hoping that the same friend that asked me for a
- 4 | favor to hire his uncle, I was just talking to him.
- 5 | Q. All right. With regard to your cigarette activities, you
- 6 were stopped in Pennsylvania July 10, 2016, by a state trooper;
- 7 | is that correct?
- 8 A. Yes, I was.
- 9 Q. And the trooper -- he stopped you for speeding. Ultimately
- 10 after some discussions, he searches your car; and you've got,
- 11 what, about 332 cartons of cigarettes in your trunk?
- 12 A. There was actually, if I'm not mistaken, 334. One was
- 13 missing --
- 14 Q. Okay.
- 15 A. -- and they charged me with 333.
- 16 Q. All right.
- 17 A. But one was missing.
- 18 Q. All right. Now, this is July 10, 2016, and we're talking
- 19 about approximately 11 months after -- 10 months after Dollar
- 20 Stretcher has closed.
- 21 A. Okay.
- 22 0. I mean is that accurate?
- 23 $\|$ A. You have the dates there. I would say it is.
- 24 Q. All right. And so you are still engaging in your
- 25 operations even though your primary source, the Dollar

- 1 Stretcher, is closed?
- 2 A. It was very difficult at that time.
- 3 Q. It was very difficult at that time?
- 4 A. Because after that -- after the Dollar Stretcher closed,
- 5 | getting cigarettes in Winchester was never the same.
- 6 | Q. Oh, okay. Well, do you have any idea why you told the
- 7 | trooper that this was your approximately 50th run with
- 8 cigarettes this year? You begin your runs early in the morning
- 9 from Long Island, New York. You head to eight or nine selected
- 10 stores in the Winchester, Virginia area. Fairchild then loads
- 11 up approximately \$20,000 worth of cigarettes and proceeds back
- 12 | to Long Island via a portion of I-78. Fairchild received
- 13 approximately \$1,000 per run. Apparently, it wasn't too hard
- 14 | to get cigarettes, was it?
- 15 A. But that doesn't explain how they were obtained. That just
- 16 | explains that in a nutshell, I would drive down there and get
- 17 | cigarettes. I can tell you this though. When the Dollar
- 18 Stretcher was open that was my first stop every time.
- 19 Q. So, Mr. Fairchild, 50 trips in 2016 by July 10th, \$20,000
- 20 of cigarettes per trip, 8 or 9 different stores, and it all
- 21 went downhill after the Dollar Stretcher closed? Is that what
- 22 | you're trying to tell this jury?
- 23 \parallel A. No. I'm just saying it got harder. It was harder. The
- 24 | Newports were limited. You had certain --
- 25 Q. What you're saying is the Dollar Stretcher was --

1 MR. STEIN: Objection, Your Honor. He's --2 Q. -- irrelevant to your operation --3 THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. Stone. Mr. Stein. 4 MR. STEIN: I object. He has again cut off the witness before he was finished. 5 THE COURT: I think he asked him a yes or no 6 7 question, and then he kept going so --8 MR. STEIN: The witness is entitled to explain his 9 answer. 10 THE COURT: He can explain his answer on redirect. 11 Mr. Stone, go ahead and ask your question over or ask 12 another question. 13 BY MR. STONE: Q. So I think we've established you were just doing fine 14 15 without the Dollar Stretcher; right? 16 A. It took me longer without the Dollar Stretcher. 17 It took you longer? You had made 50 trips --No, it took me longer --18 19 -- by July 10, 2016, and you're saying that it took you 20 longer? 21 A. To get the cigarettes. You know, there was a -- to get the 22 cigarettes, it takes longer. If you can get a hundred at one 23 stop and now you can't get that hundred --24 Q. So you're bringing back \$20,000 worth of cigarettes, and 25 you can only buy them five at a time according to your

- 1 | testimony. So were you going to like a hundred stores in
- 2 | Frederick County, Virginia?
- 3 $\|$ A. No. You could buy -- some you could get 25 and some you
- 4 could get 5 and some you could get 10 and some you could get 5
- 5 | Marlboros and 5 Newports and then 15 of other ones.
- 6 Q. All right. Now, when you got stopped on November -- so
- 7 July 10, 2016, you get popped, 300 cartons, and basically they
- 8 -- what did they give you? A citation --
- 9 A. No.
- 10 \mathbb{Q} . -- and let you go?
- 11 A. They arrested me and then I was bailed out. And then I --
- 12 | the case finally settled with no probation. Just a fine.
- 13 Q. You just paid a fine?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. And on -- for that trip, the Federal Government didn't try
- 16 | to charge you with any of that; right?
- 17 A. I wasn't indicted at that time.
- 18 Q. All right. And you didn't pay any taxes to Pennsylvania --
- 19 A. Yes, I did.
- 20 Q. -- or anything? Huh?
- 21 A. I paid -- there was restitution. I paid -- they charged me
- 22 | \$5,000 just roughly.
- 23 Q. Okay. As a fine?
- 24 A. That was the taxes that they -- they charged per carton.
- 25 Q. Uh-huh. So the state where you were actually stopped, they

- 1 actually charged you --
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 \mathbb{Q} . -- for the taxes?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And you paid that --
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 \mathbb{Q} . -- and you paid a fine?
- 8 A. Yeah. There was a fine. There was taxes per carton.
- 9 Yeah.
- 10 Q. Okay. And so you get indicted. And we're talking November
- 11 or October 2017 you get indicted. Your cigarette activities
- 12 | continue unabated from July 2016 up into October 2017; correct?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. All right. So you're still running your business. Still
- 15 going to eight or nine different stores. Still buying \$20,000
- 16 a week of cigarettes?
- 17 A. Roughly, yeah.
- 18 | Q. All right. And clearly you're not buying from the Dollar
- 19 | Stretcher; right?
- 20 A. The Dollar Stretcher was closed.
- 21 Q. So on November 29th and 30th you talked to Mr. Stein,
- 22 Mr. Ellinger, and the officers investigating this case;
- 23 | correct?
- 24 A. Yes, I did.
- 25 Q. And the main thing that they wanted to talk to you about

- 1 | was the Dollar Stretcher?
- 2 $\|$ A. No. They wanted to talk about my activity in obtaining
- 3 cigarettes from the Winchester area.
- 4 Q. Okay. Well, I mean the Government gave us your -- the
- 5 narrative of what they talked to you about. And the only store
- 6 that I see listed is the Dollar Stretcher.
- $7 \parallel A$. The other stores must have been playing by the rules. I
- 8 don't know the exact laws in Virginia to sell cigarettes. I
- 9 | just knew that I needed to buy cigarettes that I could sell in
- 10 New York. So if the store was telling me they would only give
- 11 me five, then I would just take five and leave. If Reba was
- 12 | willing to give me more, then I gladly took more and went on my
- 13 | way.
- 14 Q. I mean don't you think that it's shocking that the agents
- 15 didn't want to ask you about the eight or nine other stores --
- 16 | A. I don't --
- 17 \mathbb{Q} . -- of who you had been buying \$20,000 per week of
- 18 cigarettes from September 2015 up until you got stopped on
- 19 November 29, 2017? They didn't ask you about any of that.
- 20 | They asked you about a store that had been closed since
- 21 September of 2015.
- 22 A. I don't know the laws in the state of Virginia, but I
- 23 \parallel answered -- I told them what I told them.
- $24 \parallel Q$. You told them about one store that had been closed since
- 25 | Labor Day 2015. You didn't tell them about any other stores.

- 1 | They didn't even ask you. I mean what kind of investigation --
- 2 A. I don't know what to say.
- 3 \mathbb{Q} . -- are they doing?
- 4 A. I don't know what you want me to say. Like...
- 5 Q. I mean didn't it shock you that --
- 6 A. No.
- 7 | Q. -- you'd been running cigarettes for over two years after
- 8 that store closed, and they never thought about asking you
- 9 about any other stores even though you had told a trooper I
- 10 would go to 8 or 9 stores, \$20,000 a week, this is my 50th
- 11 | trip? Sounds like you were making a hundred trips a year, and
- 12 | they didn't even ask.
- 13 A. When I spoke to that trooper that you keep bringing up, I
- 14 was -- I was in a situation so him and I talked. And actually
- 15 to be honest, he told me what do you make? A thousand a week?
- 16 | So I said, yeah, I make a thousand a week. I wasn't going to
- 17 | sit there and paint the picture for him. He had figured out
- 18 | that this was something I was doing and so I said yeah.
- 19 Q. All right. Now, you ultimately testified before the grand
- 20 | jury January 9, 2018, for this case; correct?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And so, you know, during a grand jury, Mr. Stein asks you
- 23 | questions. You answer questions. Correct?
- 24 A. In the grand jury, I don't think Mr. Stein was asking me
- 25 | the questions.

- 1 Q. Okay. Well, if I relate to you that the grand jury
- 2 | transcript that we have indicates Mr. Stein asked the
- 3 | questions, do you think that's inaccurate?
- 4 A. I don't know. On that day, I went to a courtroom filled
- 5 | with people, and I gave testimony. And if you're saying that
- 6 Mr. Stein asked those questions, I don't remember that. I
- 7 don't know.
- 8 Q. Mr. Fairchild, let me hand you this document and just ask
- 9 you if this refreshes your recollection of who was asking you
- 10 | the questions.
- 11 A. Yeah, this is -- it says Mr. Stein. And then it has a
- 12 question. Mr. Fairchild.
- 13 Q. So does that refresh your recollection?
- 14 A. Not really but okay.
- 15 Q. All right. Well, during the grand jury you're asked
- 16 | questions about the Government's investigation, and you provide
- 17 | information; correct?
- 18 A. I gave them grand jury testimony about the cigarettes I got
- 19 | in Virginia.
- 20 Q. Okay. Do you recall that during the grand jury, a grand
- 21 | juror actually asked you a question?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. So somebody -- do you recall that they asked you about
- 24 whether or not the people who were working in the store asked
- 25 | you about what you were doing with these cigarettes?

- 1 A. If you have the question, can I see it?
- 2 Q. Sure. I'm going to hand you the portion of the transcript.
- 3 A. Okay. I read the question.
- $4 \parallel Q$. All right. Does that refresh your recollection?
- 5 A. I still can't remember the juror saying this. And if
- 6 | that's what I said and they have testimony, yeah. I mean...
- 7 | Q. So you would agree that a grand juror asked you, "You said
- 8 you've done this for five years. During that time, they didn't
- 9 ask you what you were doing with this large amount of
- 10 cigarettes you were purchasing?"
- 11 And your response, "We never really got into it. I just
- 12 came, picked up cigarettes, and took them back to New York."
- 13 A. I don't know what he meant by they never asked you. Who is
- 14 | they?
- 15 Q. I presume the people you were testifying about during grand
- 16 | jury. So I'm presuming that would be Ms. Myers and
- 17 Ms. Lindquist because that's who you were questioned about;
- 18 | right? The Dollar Stretcher. When you went to the grand jury.
- 19 A. I was questioned on the testimony. They asked me
- 20 questions. I answered them.
- 21 Q. All right. And when you went --
- 22 A. Like I said, I'm not a lawyer. I don't -- you know, I
- 23 | don't know how this works. I never testified before. I have
- 24 never been in front of a grand jury.
- 25 $\|$ Q. All right. But we do know they didn't ask you about what

- 1 | you were doing with cigarettes and who the retailers, the eight
- 2 or nine you told the trooper about, from September 2015 up to
- 3 | November 29, 2017. We know that; right?
- 4 A. I mean -- I don't know what to say.
- 5 Q. All right. Also on your phone calls that you had no idea
- 6 were being intercepted, do you recall talking to one of your
- 7 | friends around October 11, 2017? Talking to them about
- 8 Mr. O'Connell. The fact that he's going to appear pursuant to
- 9 a deposition and that he's going to rat you out and that you're
- 10 | being charged with conspiracy. I mean do you remember any of
- 11 | that?
- 12 A. Can I see what you're talking about?
- 13 Q. So you don't remember?
- 14 A. I spoke to a few people. I don't know who you're talking
- 15 about but...
- 16 Q. Do you ever remember telling your friends in New York --
- 17 A. Like I said --
- 18 Q. When your friend asked you about --
- 19 A. Dennis had sold cigarettes to all of these individuals. So
- 20 | if he talked about it, it was because they knew Dennis
- 21 personally.
- 22 | Q. All right. But do you recall answering a question for one
- 23 of your friends who asked you what's the conspiracy though, and
- 24 you said me and him; me and Dennis conspired?
- 25 A. That gentleman -- that gentleman had asked me like what was

- 1 going on, and I just mentioned that Dennis and I were involved
- 2 | in a conspiracy. But I didn't pull out the charges and read
- 3 off all the --
- 4 Q. Right.
- 5 A. -- people. He didn't know.
- 6 Q. So you and a friend, somebody close to you, somebody I
- 7 | presume who you trust enough to talk about the case, he asked
- 8 | you what conspiracy, who conspired. And you say me and him, me
- 9 and Dennis.
- 10 A. Well, I didn't pull out --
- 11 | Q. That's what you said; right?
- 12 A. I didn't pull out the sheet I got when I left court that
- 13 | said this conspiracy between Lisa, Reba, John Fairchild. To
- 14 mention Lisa and Reba, he don't know who they are.
- 15 Q. You knew what your charges were. You had been indicted.
- 16 You had gone to court.
- 17 A. Yeah, I was involved in a conspiracy.
- 18 Q. And when you told your friend after --
- 19 A. I was involved in a conspiracy.
- 20 Q. -- you had been indicted, after you had been arraigned, he
- 21 | said who conspired? You said me and him. Me and Dennis.
- 22 Right? You didn't say you and Reba or you and Lisa. You said
- 23 | me and him. You and Dennis. Right? That's what you said?
- $24 \parallel A$. To be honest with you, I'm not exactly sure what I said
- 25 | because I don't remember the question.

```
1
              MR. STONE: Your Honor -- well...
    BY MR. STONE:
 2
 3
    Q. Mr. Fairchild, we're going to play an exhibit that was
 4
    provided to us by the United States referencing your recorded
    phone conversations with your friends in New York and hopefully
 5
    this will refresh your recollection.
 6
 7
              MR. STONE: Your Honor, we're going to try to skip
    ahead a little bit on this.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: All right.
10
              MR. STONE: It's I think about a ten-minute phone
11
    call.
12
              (Play audio.)
13
              MR. STEIN: (Indiscernible.)
                          I'm sorry. Hold on with the sound,
14
              THE COURT:
15
   Mr. Beck.
16
              MR. STEIN:
                          I'm sorry. I thought there was going to
17
   be a transcript.
18
              MR. STONE:
                          No.
19
              MR. STEIN: Okay. No objection.
20
              THE COURT: Okay.
21
   BY MR. STONE:
22
    Q. All right. Mr. Fairchild, what I'm going to play for you
    to try to refresh your recollection, this is a phone call from
23
24
    October 11, 2017, 8:12:02 A.M. It was obtained pursuant to the
25
    Suffolk -- I guess Suffolk County wiretap that they were doing
```

```
1
   on your phone.
              THE COURT: Mr. Stein.
 2
 3
             MR. STEIN: Your Honor, I would like to see the phone
 4
   call first. (Indiscernible.) I'd like to read it.
 5
             MR. STONE:
                          Ten eighteen.
             MR. STEIN:
                          Ten minutes and eighteen seconds? I'd
 6
 7
   like to read it.
              Your Honor, I think that we should be able to read
 8
 9
   this before they play a ten-minute clip to see whether there
10
   might be an objection for any number of reasons.
11
              THE COURT: Well, okay. Because it's a ten-minute
12
   clip, but you can probably read faster than that. So go ahead
13
   and read it.
14
              How many pages is it, Mr. Stone?
15
             MR. STONE:
                          It's not very long, Your Honor.
16
              THE COURT: Could you count them for me.
17
             MR. STONE: Let's see. It is actually four pages and
18
   maybe the third of another page. Double spaced. Probably four
19
   pages total.
20
              THE COURT: Okay. Take a look at it.
21
             MR. BECK: Your Honor, may I make a point of
22
    clarification just so the Court understands?
23
              THE COURT: Yes, sir.
24
             MR. BECK: I think the actual talking is a lot less
25
   than ten minutes because as I understand the way these wiretaps
```

```
1
   work is the police officers have to drop the audio down --
 2
              THE COURT: Right.
 3
             MR. BECK: -- if there's a discussion about something
 4
   that's not relevant to their investigation.
 5
              THE COURT: Right.
             MR. BECK: So there is some down time on here, but I
 6
 7
   guess the entire thing takes ten minutes to play.
              THE COURT: What we're going to hear is ten minutes
 8
 9
   or you mean with the down time is ten minutes because there's
10
11
             MR. BECK: That's right. The whole thing is ten
12
   minutes but the down time --
13
              THE COURT: Okay.
14
             MR. BECK: -- may be five minutes or so here and
15
   there. It keeps going up and down.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. So that's what you got in
17
   discovery, Mr. Stone, from the Government?
18
             MR. STONE: Correct.
19
             THE COURT: Okay.
20
              (Pause.)
21
             MR. STEIN: No objection, Your Honor.
22
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
23
   BY MR. STONE:
24
   Q. All right. Again, Mr. Fairchild, this is October 11, 2017,
25
   8:12:02 A.M.
```

```
1
        (Play audio.)
              MR. STONE: I think it resumes at 8:36 approximately.
 2
 3
              THE COURT: Counsel, do you want to speed it up to
 4
    where it picks up again or do you want that gap there?
   Mr. Stein?
 5
              MR. STEIN: Your Honor, at this point, they might ask
 6
 7
   the witness whether his recollection is --
        (Audio continued playing.)
 8
 9
              THE COURT: Well, hold on. Let's stop and go
    backwards, Mr. Beck, so we don't miss that.
10
11
        (Stopped audio.)
12
              MR. BECK: I've stopped it.
13
              THE COURT: Mr. Stone asked to play it. It's his
    cross so we'll do what you want to do, Mr. Stone, with this.
14
15
              MR. STONE: Your Honor, we need to finish this.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
17
              MR. STONE: The relevant portion is towards the end.
    But just so it's in context.
18
19
              THE COURT: Okay.
20
              MR. STEIN: Your Honor, may we approach?
21
              THE COURT: Sure.
22
        (Bench conference commenced outside the hearing of the
23
        jury.)
24
              THE COURT: Mr. Stein, he showed you the transcript
25
   of this audio that he's playing. You read it. You should have
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JOHN FAIRCHILD - CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. STONE

seen it before because it was provided to them in discovery. And you told me you had no objection to them playing it. So why are we up here? MR. STEIN: Because there's a point past -- the ostensible purpose was to refresh his recollection about who he was talking to. I think by this point, we when hit a gap, the witness will remember who he was talking to and the rest of this is just gratuitous. MR. STONE: No --THE COURT: Mr. Stone. Go ahead. MR. STONE: Your Honor, the key provision is we specifically asked him about who was involved in the conspiracy. He feigned as if he didn't recall. So we're going to refresh his recollection. It's at the end of this recording, but the whole thing needs to be heard to be put in context. THE COURT: Well, and more importantly -- and I agree with that. More importantly, as well, you saw the transcript and had no objection to it. I think we're just wasting time up There was no objection. I don't find it objectionable. Go ahead and finish this, Mr. Stone. MR. STONE: Thank you. THE COURT: The objection is overruled. (Bench conference concluded.) (Continue playing audio.)

- 1 BY MR. STONE:
- 2 | Q. So, Mr. Fairchild, after listening to that call, that's you
- 3 on the call; right?
- $4 \mid A$. Yes, that is me.
- 5 Q. And who are you talking to?
- 6 A. This guy Al.
- $7 \parallel Q$. All right. And Al is someone you trust enough to discuss
- 8 | your personal business; correct?
- 9 A. I told everybody my personal business since I was 10 years
- 10 | old.
- 11 Q. All right. And he asked you what's the conspiracy, and you
- 12 | said me and him conspired; right?
- 13 A. That's what I said.
- 14 Q. In your own words, after you got indicted, October 11, 2017
- 15 | --
- 16 A. Was my --
- 17 \mathbb{Q} . -- the conspiracy is you and him conspired.
- 18 \parallel A. But I also told him there was a 15-page indictment so I --
- 19 | I abbreviated. I don't know what to tell you. I mean I'm not
- 20 a lawyer.
- 21 Q. You've told us.
- 22 A. I'm not a lawyer. He asked me what the conspiracy is.
- 23 $\|$ Q. And you told him me and him conspired.
- 24 A. I didn't read the indictment to him. No, I didn't. The
- 25 | indictment wasn't read.

Q. All right.

1

- 2 A. I'm not a lawyer. I don't know.
- 3 Q. Oh, I know.
- $4 \parallel A$. I mean I'm not a lawyer. I'm a criminal. My whole life.
- 5 | I broke the law.
- 6 Q. All right. Now, did the Government or did your lawyer let
- 7 | you know that in addition to tapping your phone, they also had
- 8 | all your text messages? Did they tell you that?
- 9 A. Did the Government tell me that?
- 10 Q. Yeah. Did the Government -- did Mr. Stein or Mr. Ellinger
- 11 when they were meeting you doing your trial preparations, did
- 12 | they let you know that they had all your text --
- 13 | A. They --
- 14 Q. -- messages during this wiretap too?
- 15 A. A wiretap, yeah.
- 16 Q. All right. So they --
- 17 A. But I don't know how they would get my text messages. I
- 18 | don't -- I don't know how the wiretap works. I don't know.
- 19 | There was an investigation in New York against me that
- 20 coincided with this. So I don't know what else to tell you.
- 21 | New York arrested me. Virginia arrested me. They all got me.
- 22 | I retired.
- 23 Q. All right.
- 24 A. Trying to make a new life.
- 25 Q. All right.

- 1 A. Is that okay?
- 2 Q. I mean I hope so.
- 3 A. You make mistakes; right? I made mistakes.
- $4 \parallel Q$. It sounds like based upon that phone call, you've got a
- 5 real aversion towards people who rat and cooperate.
- 6 MR. STEIN: Your Honor, this an argumentative. It's
- 7 | not a question.
- 8 THE COURT: Mr. Stone, was that a question?
- 9 MR. STONE: I'm just asking him about what was on
- 10 | that audio, Your Honor.
- MR. STEIN: He wasn't asking at that point what was
- 12 on the audio. He was -- he was just going on in terms of the
- 13 argument that he was having about what Mr. Fairchild was doing.
- 14 THE COURT: Sustained. I think it was a comment. If
- 15 you have a question, Mr. Stone, ask it.
- MR. STONE: Yes, Your Honor.
- 17 BY MR. STONE:
- 18 | Q. Now, Mr. Fairchild, your cigarette operation changed a
- 19 | little bit in the -- I guess the summer and the fall of 2017;
- 20 | correct?
- 21 A. What do you mean changed?
- 22 Q. Well, your method of transportation to get to Virginia. At
- 23 | that time, you didn't just drive down; right?
- 24 A. No.
- 25 | Q. You started flying down?

- 1 A. Sometimes I would take a flight.
- 2 Q. All right. So you would take a flight from where?
- 3 | LaGuardia?
- 4 A. From JFK.
- $5 \parallel Q$. From JFK. And then would you fly to Dulles?
- 6 A. To Dulles.
- 7 Q. And then what? You'd rent a car?
- 8 A. I would rent a car.
- 9 | Q. And then you'd go get your cigarettes, and then you would
- 10 drive more?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And in actuality, you apparently befriended someone who you
- 13 put to work and whomever that someone was would go buy all the
- 14 cigarettes for you and then have them ready for you when you
- 15 got to Winchester; correct?
- 16 $\|$ A. When -- like I said, when the Dollar Stretcher closed and
- 17 | that everybody -- all the other stores were raided, yeah, it
- 18 got tougher. That's what I was saying. It got tougher. It
- 19 | got real tough.
- 20 Q. Well, I'm asking you about October 2017.
- 21 A. And that's after the raid and the Dollar Stretcher closed
- 22 | so it was tougher way before that.
- 23 $\|Q$. But somehow you were getting through?
- 24 $\|$ A. I'm very persistent. I, you know, do what I had to do.
- 25 Q. Somehow those 8 or 9 other retailers made it to where you

- could buy your 20,000 a week; right?
- $2 \parallel A$. Not really. There was other people involved at that point.
- 3 Q. All right. So --
- 4 A. It wasn't easy like that. It wasn't --
- 5 Q. Who was the person that you were able to convince to buy
- 6 | your cigarettes in Winchester in October of 2017?
- 7 \parallel A. It was a friend that used to work at the dollar -- one of
- 8 | those cigarette stores.
- 9 Q. Okay. So what was your friend's name?
- 10 A. Liberty.
- 11 Q. And what was your arrangement with Liberty?
- 12 A. I paid her rent.
- 13 Q. So you paid her money and then she --
- MR. STEIN: Objection. This is well beyond the scope
- 15 of the cross -- of the direct examination and completely
- 16 | irrelevant to this case.
- 17 THE COURT: Mr. Stone.
- 18 MR. STONE: Well, Judge, the Government -- he claims
- 19 | that his business basically shut down after the Dollar
- 20 | Stretcher closed. And clearly this evidence impeaches that. I
- 21 | think it's relevant and material, and I think I should be able
- 22 | to question him. I'm almost done.
- 23 MR. STEIN: I think that's a mischaracterization,
- 24 | Your Honor. The witness testified it got harder. He never
- 25 | said anything about it shutting down.

- 1 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 2 BY MR. STONE:
- 3 Q. So this person's name is Liberty?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 | Q. What's Liberty's last name?
- 6 A. I don't know.
- 7 | O. You don't know?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. You're under oath. You're supposed to be testifying to the
- 10 | truth. You got a --
- 11 A. I don't remember her last name.
- 12 Q. -- cooperation agreement --
- 13 A. I don't remember her last name. I mean if I look at my
- 14 phone, I could probably remember. I just don't remember. I
- 15 don't remember the guy's on the phones last name.
- 16 Q. All right.
- 17 A. I barely remember Michael Stein's last name. I don't -- I
- 18 | don't know what to tell you. I've been through hell and back.
- 19 I can't remember everything. Like does that make me a bad guy?
- 20 | Q. How are you so able to remember everything you did at the
- 21 Dollar Stretcher then, Mr. Fairchild?
- 22 A. Because it was my first trip. I would go to the Dollar
- 23 | Stretcher, and then she would give me 50 Newports, and then she
- 24 | would give me 25 Marlboros and 25 Marlboro Lights. And then
- 25 | that would -- that would set my trip. And then I would go from

- 1 | there, and I would get five here. Sometimes I would get two.
- 2 And then I would just keep on clawing my way to the number.
- 3 | Whatever I had enough money to buy. I don't -- I don't know
- 4 what you want me to tell you.
- 5 Q. So this person --
- $6 \parallel A$. That was the start. The Dollar Stretcher was the start. I
- 7 | would start there. I would get enough Newports where I could
- 8 | just get five more here and five more there.
- 9 Q. So this person, Liberty -- you would actually somehow get
- 10 | your money to Liberty in Frederick County, Virginia so that
- 11 | Liberty could buy your cigarettes; correct?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And you didn't even know Liberty's last name, but yet
- 14 you're buying \$20,000 a week of cigarettes?
- 15 A. She wouldn't buy 20,000. She would buy maybe 50 of them.
- 16 | She wouldn't -- half the time, I didn't have the money to give
- 17 to her to get them.
- 18 Q. All right.
- 19 A. Because she can't buy them on her good looks. She needed
- 20 | the money. And the money -- I didn't get the money until
- 21 | Friday. So on Sunday I had to go do what I had to do.
- 22 Q. All right. So Liberty's last name unknown. Somehow you
- 23 | would get your money to her even though you didn't know her
- 24 | last name. And you trusted --
- MR. STEIN: Your Honor, I object. He's

mischaracterizing the evidence again. The witness clearly said he doesn't remember her last name. Not that he didn't -- that 2 3 it's an unknown thing. He said he forgot it. He said he 4 almost forgot my name. And he went on and explained his forgetfulness. And for counsel to say that he testified to 5 something else is just incorrect. 6 7 THE COURT: Mr. Stone. MR. STONE: Your Honor, I mean I don't even know what 8 I could ask him anymore. I seems as if he can't remember 9 10 anything. So I'll move on. 11 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Stone. BY MR. STONE: 12 13 Q. Mr. Fairchild, did Reba Myers or Lisa Lindquist ever assist you in transporting cigarettes that you purchased in Virginia 14 15 outside of the state of Virginia? 16 A. No. 17 Q. Did Reba Myers or Lisa Lindquist ever assist you in 18 redistributing your cigarettes in New York or any other 19 location? 20 A. No. Q. After you sold your cigarettes and made whatever your 21 2.2 profit was, did Reba Myers or Lisa Lindquist receive a cut of 23 your profit?

A. I used the money to buy more cigarettes from them, but I

24

2.5

don't --

Did they receive a cut of your profit? 1 No. I just came back and bought more from them. 2 Α. 3 So they did not receive a cut of your profit? 4 Well, the profits were used to buy more cigarettes from Α. them so I don't know what that means but... 5 Q. Again, Mr. Fairchild, this is a simple question. 6 7 MR. STEIN: Asked and answered, Your Honor. BY MR. STONE: 8 Q. If you made --9 10 I object. It's been asked and answered. MR. STEIN: 11 MR. STONE: Your Honor, it's nonresponsive. 12 THE COURT: He didn't ask his question yet. 13 BY MR. STONE: 14 Q. Mr. Fairchild --15 THE COURT: And it's on cross. If it's asked and 16 answered, he's able to ask the same question again on cross. 17 So overruled. BY MR. STONE: 18 19 Q. Of the \$10 you claim you made on the cigarettes that you 20 were buying in Virginia when you redistributed them in 21 New York, out of every \$10, did you give Ms. Myers or 2.2 Ms. Lindquist a cut, a percentage? Did they get \$3 out of 23 your --24 No. Α.

25

Q. -- every 10?

- 1 A. No.
- 2 | Q. Because they're not part of your operation.
- 3 A. I don't know what you want me to say to that. I don't have
- $4 \parallel -- \text{ I don't know that.}$ How would I answer that? I bought the
- 5 cigarettes from the Dollar Stretcher.
- 6 MR. STONE: No further questions, Your Honor.
- 7 THE COURT: Mr. Beck.
- 8 MR. BECK: Thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. BECK:

9

- 11 Q. All right. Mr. Fairchild, my name is Barry Beck; and I
- 12 represent Lisa Lindquist. I want to talk to you about this
- 13 \parallel statement that you gave to Mr. Stein and Mr. Ellinger right
- 14 after you were arrested in November of 2017 for continuing to
- 15 traffic in cigarettes. You remember talking to them about your
- 16 | friend, Adam?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Okay.
- 19 A. I wouldn't call him a friend.
- 20 | Q. Well, let's say a former associate.
- 21 A. He went to get cigarettes for me on several occasions and
- 22 robbed me one time, too, but whatever. He's not a friend.
- 23 | Q. Do you remember telling them that Adam made ten buying
- 24 trips for you?
- 25 A. Sounds about right. Yes.

- 1 | Q. Ten. That's what you told them; right?
- 2 \parallel A. If that's what's in the testimony, yeah. Then --
- 3 $\|$ Q. Would you like me to show it to you?
- 4 A. Sure.
- 5 Q. Because you initialed -- apparently what happened was they
- 6 | typed this up, and you initialed it as being correct or not.
- 7 | And you can ignore my highlighting on the second page. That
- 8 was not part of the original. And what I just asked you about
- 9 | is on the first page.
- 10 A. Is this where it says he personally bought cigarettes about
- 11 once every ten days?
- 12 Q. No. Read it carefully. It says Adam made ten buying trips
- 13 | for me. You don't see that?
- 14 A. Yeah. Adam made ten buying trips to Virginia.
- 15 Q. And you initialed this thing to correct some other things
- 16 | that were written that weren't correct, but you did not initial
- 17 | that, did you?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. You didn't change that?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 | Q. Okay. And you told Mr. Stein and Deputy Ellinger that the
- 22 reason he stopped making trips for you is because he was
- 23 | stealing from you or cheating; correct?
- 24 A. One time he didn't come back with any. He lied to me and
- 25 stole my money.

- 1 | Q. Okay. So that's how the relationship ended?
- 2 A. That's how it ended.
- 3 $\|$ Q. All right. So let me paint the chronology if I can of how
- 4 | this statement came about. You get arrested -- well, first of
- 5 | all, you get indicted in October of 2017 in this case. You
- 6 continued to run your business. And in November of 2017, they
- 7 catch you in West Virginia with all those cigarettes, and they
- 8 | bring you to the barracks. And apparently you got five or
- 9 six -- well, three agents there, including Deputy Ellinger.
- 10 You got Mr. Stein there. And you know you're in a big problem
- 11 | then, don't you?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. Okay. And not only do you know this -- not only do you
- 14 know you've already been indicted for doing stuff in the past,
- 15 you know that you just did more stuff; right?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. So you're in a world of trouble right here; right?
- 18 $\|$ A. I was in a situation that I knew was very bad. And when
- 19 | you say world of trouble, I think of a terminally disease. I
- 20 mean it's cigarettes. It's not guns. It's not heroin. So
- 21 when you say world of trouble, I don't --
- 22 | Q. Well, it's just a manner of speaking.
- 23 A. I mean world of trouble is like --
- 24 Q. It was not a bad --
- 25 A. World of trouble I just murdered somebody. I'm never

- 1 getting out of jail. I mean that's world of trouble.
- 2 | Q. You were in a bad spot, weren't you?
- 3 A. I was in a bad spot.
- 4 Q. A very bad spot.
- 5 A. I was in a bad spot.
- 6 Q. Okay.
- 7 A. I was in a bad spot. It wasn't my best day.
- 8 Q. And at that time, you decided to be a rat?
- 9 A. At that time, I explored the options available to me and
- 10 | felt that putting this behind me and doing the right thing was
- 11 to benefit me the most.
- 12 Q. And at that time, you knew that somebody else who had been
- 13 | charged in your case was Lisa Lindquist; right?
- 14 A. Yeah.
- 15 Q. And you knew that they wanted to prosecute and convict Lisa
- 16 | Lindquist, didn't you?
- 17 $\|$ A. I knew it was a case against all of us. What they were
- 18 | doing, I don't -- I don't know what their motives are. I just
- 19 knew there was a case against us.
- 20 | Q. Well, they wouldn't have prosecuted her if they didn't want
- 21 | to convict her; right?
- 22 A. I mean they arrested us all so...
- 23 $\|$ Q. Okay. And you were there trying to help yourself by
- 24 | talking to them; right?
- 25 A. I was just trying to do the right thing. I had lived a

- 1 | life of crime up to that point, and I was trying to take a
- 2 different path.
- 3 Q. Once you got caught again?
- 4 A. Yeah. Well, isn't that the way it always works? Right?
- 5 When the shit hits the fan, you figure out what you're going to
- 6 do to clean it up?
- $7 \parallel Q$. Well, most people would have done that once they got
- 8 | indicted, but I guess it didn't work for you.
- 9 A. Well, I'm not most people. I don't know what to tell you.
- 10 Q. Okay.
- 11 A. My awakening came on November 29th.
- 12 | Q. All right. So you meet with them, and you tell them -- you
- 13 answer their -- you ask questions, and Mr. Stein said they
- 14 didn't ask you anything except for about Dollar Stretcher;
- 15 | right? That's what it says?
- 16 | A. I mean --
- 17 \mathbb{Q} . We already went through that.
- 18 A. Okay.
- 19 \mathbb{Q} . Okay. And in that statement and you said here today --
- 20 | well, first of all, you said here today your routine was to
- 21 | come from New York to West Virginia on Wednesdays and Sundays;
- 22 | correct?
- 23 A. Me or somebody that was getting them for me. Adam, Dennis.
- 24 Q. That was the routine?
- 25 A. The routine was to get cigarettes from Virginia twice a

- week on Wednesday and Sunday. Sometimes by me. Sometimes by other people. That was the routine.
- 3 $\|$ Q. And then today and in your statement when you were meeting
- 4 | with the police after you had been caught, after you had been
- 5 | indicted, they asked you how many times did you deal with Lisa
- 6 | Lindquist; right?
- 7 $\|$ A. Yeah. I guess we talked about that.
- 8 Q. Okay. Well, the memo says you did.
- 9 A. Okay.
- 10 | Q. But today you said something to the effect that -- and I'm
- 11 | not sure I understand the math, but you said 90 percent of the
- 12 | time -- let me just read it -- 90 percent of the time either
- 13 Reba or Lisa were there. And then you said 75 percent of the
- 14 | time Reba was there, and 75 percent of the time Lisa was there.
- 15 | I don't understand that math, but I guess what you were trying
- 16 | to say -- what were you trying to say?
- 17 | A. Nothing. Just when I bought cigarettes from the Dollar
- 18 | Stretcher, one of them were there.
- 19 Q. Okay. Did you know -- did you know the Dollar Stretcher
- 20 keeps or had kept records of who worked every day of the week
- 21 and -- did you know that?
- 22 A. No, I --
- 23 | Q. It wouldn't surprise you, would it?
- 24 A. I don't know how the Dollar Stretcher run their business.
- 25 Q. Would it surprise you to know that according to the records

- 1 -- and they've been looked at; you've never seen them so I'm
- $2 \parallel$ not going to ask you to look -- that Lisa Lindquist did not
- 3 | work on Sundays?
- 4 A. Okay. She didn't work on Sundays.
- 5 | Q. So you couldn't have seen her then; right?
- 6 A. No. But half the time I wasn't even the one going.
- 7 Q. So you don't know who was there when the other people went
- 8 | then; right?
- 9 A. Dennis would say he seen Reba.
- 10 | Q. Okay. But you don't know whether they saw Lisa?
- 11 A. He would tell me how the trip went. He would say all
- 12 | right, you know. He'd call me and give me a report. I went
- 13 | there. I got a bunch there. Then I got the rest here. And I
- 14 got the rest there.
- 15 Q. Okay. Well, my point is though you could not have -- if
- 16 | these records show that Lisa didn't work on Sundays, then you
- 17 | didn't see her on Sundays; right?
- 18 A. Then she didn't work on Sunday.
- 19 Q. All right. Now, also you looked at a couple of exhibits.
- 20 Government Exhibit 4-B.
- MR. BECK: Chad, could I have that, please?
- 22 BY MR. BECK:
- 23 | Q. This is the text messages that Mr. Stein showed you. Which
- 24 by the way, they seized your phone; right?
- 25 A. West Virginia seized my phone.

- 1 | Q. Okay. Are you aware that there was never any
- 2 communications on your phone between you and Lisa Lindquist?
- 3 A. Okay.
- 4 Q. All right. You don't disagree with that; right?
- 5 A. No. If that's what you're saying.
- 6 Q. Well, you don't -- you didn't have any, right, with her on
- 7 | your phone?
- 8 A. I guess not.
- 9 \mathbb{Q} . Okay. And on Exhibit 4-B, there was a communication on
- 10 October the 20th of 2013 that occurred at 1:03 P.M. If these
- 11 records show that Lisa did not work that day, you couldn't have
- 12 | seen her then either; correct?
- 13 A. No. If she didn't work, I wouldn't have seen her.
- 14 Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Fairchild, you had some conversations in
- 15 | that video -- audio we played with your friend about hoping
- 16 | that Mr. O'Connell would die and die soon; right?
- 17 \mathbb{A} . He was sick, and I said that.
- 18 Q. Right. And you called him a little "B" word? You called
- 19 | him that, didn't you?
- 20 A. I called him some very harsh names, yes.
- 21 | Q. Okay. And you had conversations with other people, too,
- 22 during this timeframe, other friends, where you discussed what
- 23 | you hoped would happen to Mr. O'Connell; right?
- 24 A. I mean I'm an open book. So if something is on my mind,
- 25 | yeah, we talked.

- 1 | Q. You remember telling people that he should go to the
- 2 | hospital and tell them his F-ing chest is bothering him and try
- 3 | to get out of the deposition that way?
- 4 A. Yeah. That's what we testified earlier.
- $5 \parallel Q$. And you remember saying that you hoped his car crashed on
- 6 the way to the deposition?
- 7 A. Did I say that?
- 8 | Q. Well, I read it. Yeah.
- 9 A. All right. Then I said it.
- 10 | Q. Okay. And do you remember one friend of yours talking to
- 11 | you, and you said something about -- well, it was right after
- 12 | the car crash comment. You said -- well, your friend said have
- 13 Lance see him. And you said, huh? And he said, yeah, tell him
- 14 -- who -- was he suggesting that you have somebody go -- who is
- 15 | this Lance?
- 16 A. Lance was a mutual friend of somebody else.
- 17 || Q. Is he a guy that would put a hurtin' on Mr. O'Connell if
- 18 you asked?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 | Q. Okay. What was he asking? What did he mean by, if you
- 21 | know, have Lance go see him?
- 22 A. I don't know what he meant by that.
- 23 Q. Okay.
- 24 A. I don't know. He said it. I didn't.
- 25 | Q. Well, it was your friend. You don't have any idea what he

- 1 | meant?
- 2 A. No, I don't know what he meant by that.
- 3 $\|$ Q. Okay. So you make all these comments over these wiretaps
- 4 | that you didn't know were being recorded?
- 5 A. No. It was a wiretap. I didn't know.
- 6 Q. And you were being wiretapped by police officers in New
- 7 York; correct?
- 8 A. I was upset. I mean my ways of earning money had just come
- 9 to an end, and I was scared. I didn't know what I was going to
- 10 do from that point forward.
- 11 Q. Sure.
- 12 $\|$ A. And for the past year, it hasn't been easy so --
- 13 | Q. And at some --
- 14 | A. I'm just --
- 15 Q. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Go ahead. Finish.
- 16 $\|$ A. I'm just a cigarette bootlegger trying to find my way. I
- 17 made a lot of mistakes. I said a lot of nasty things.
- 18 | Q. And at some point, you got a call -- or a call or an email
- 19 or communication either from Mr. Stein or Deputy Ellinger or
- 20 one of the other agents saying if you make any more efforts of
- 21 | contacting Mr. O'Connell, we're going to do something; right?
- 22 A. Yeah. I wasn't to talk to him.
- 23 \parallel Q. Okay. And so after -- then comes the date you're arrested
- 24 | later on here in November. After that arrest, you signed a
- 25 | plea agreement; right?

- 1 A. Yes.
- $2 \parallel Q$. And in that plea agreement, you agreed to plead guilty to
- 3 some of the charges in this case?
- 4 A. I pled guilty to conspiracy to traffic contraband
- 5 cigarettes. Two charges.
- 6 Q. That's right.
- 7 A. I pled guilty to them both.
- 8 Q. You have never --
- 9 A. The charges in this indictment, I pled guilty.
- 10 | Q. You have never been charged with attempting to obstruct
- 11 | justice, have you?
- 12 | A. No, I wasn't.
- 13 Q. And you have never been charged with attempting to
- 14 | intimidate Mr. O'Connell, have you?
- 15 A. No, I haven't.
- 16 Q. Now, you also have some problems in New York, too, don't
- 17 | you?
- 18 A. I don't think they're really problems.
- 19 Q. Well, you consider being indicted not a problem?
- 20 A. Well, because the case is -- gambling is legal now in the
- 21 | federal system. They shot it down. And the D.A. that was
- 22 | handling the case quit, and the new D.A. won't even get back to
- 23 | my lawyers about plea bargains. So I don't -- New York, no,
- 24 | it's not a problem.
- 25 | Q. Well, you -- it's not a problem you're under indictment in

- 1 New York?
- 2 A. No because I'm trying to plead, and they won't let me. The
- 3 | D.A.s -- they won't even call my lawyer.
- $4 \parallel Q$. But it's not resolved yet, is it?
- 5 A. Some of the people are resolved.
- 6 | Q. You're under a felony indictment in the state of New York;
- 7 | correct?
- 8 A. No, I don't think it's a felony.
- 9 Q. You don't?
- 10 A. It's never been -- it's never been -- I'm not a lawyer. I
- 11 was charged with a crime, but it's not felony because I'm not
- 12 going to Riverhead Court. It's in Central Islip.
- 13 | Q. Well, isn't that what all these undercover recordings were
- 14 about? Isn't that what led to you being --
- 15 A. Yeah, but when it's a felony, they send it to Riverhead.
- 16 | Q. So you're thinking that the New York State police up there
- 17 | went through all the trouble to do these wiretaps and --
- 18 A. It was the district attorney's office.
- 19 Q. Well, you think they went to all that trouble just to
- 20 charge you with a misdemeanor --
- 21 | A. I mean my --
- 22 Q. Let me finish my question, sir. You think they went to all
- 23 | that trouble to do these wiretaps -- I mean there's --
- 24 | apparently aren't the easiest things -- all that trouble just
- 25 | to charge you with a misdemeanor?

1 MR. STEIN: I object, Your Honor. He's calling for 2 speculation from this witness of the district attorney's 3 charging decisions. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Beck. MR. BECK: I'll withdraw the question, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: All right. 6 7 MR. BECK: I'll withdraw it. BY MR. BECK: 8 And you signed a plea agreement though with Mr. Stein and 9 10 the Government; correct? 11 A. Yes, I did. 12 And in that plea agreement, they've offered or they've 13 suggested that you might get some relief in your case depending 14 on how you cooperate; isn't that correct? 15 There was no quarantees. It was said to me that if I 16 cooperate and tell the facts that I remember them best that 17 maybe at the end -- maybe at the end that it could help me. 18 But it wasn't discussed on how it could help me. How much it 19 could help me. 20 Well, isn't it a fact that your understanding is that if 21 they're sat --2.2 A. If --Let me finish the question, sir. If they're satisfied with 23 24 your performance, Mr. Stein can get up at a later date and say 25 to this Court give him a sentence less than he would otherwise

- 1 get? Isn't that exactly the way it works?
- $2 \parallel A$. It is my understanding that at the end of the day, this is
- 3 | all going to come down to what the judge thinks about the case.
- 4 Not what Mr. Stein does.
- 5 Q. That's not what I asked you. I know the judge has the
- 6 final call.
- $7 \parallel A$. No because in a federal system, there's a score. And I
- 8 | don't do -- I don't score very well on the system. I made a
- 9 lot of mistakes in my life. I was raised on my own since ten.
- 10 | I committed a lot of crimes. So now when you're in a federal
- 11 system, there's a scoring, and they score it. And based on
- 12 | your priors that's the scoring. So --
- 13 Q. Okay. Let me try the question one more time. Okay.
- 14 Because you're either not understanding or you don't want to
- 15 answer it.
- 16 A. No, I don't understand.
- 17 | Q. You understand that this plea agreement, if the Government
- 18 feels that you've cooperated to their satisfaction, that they
- 19 | will hopefully -- you hope that they will come in here and say,
- 20 | Judge, we would like you to go easy or give him a lesser
- 21 | sentence because he helped us? That's true, isn't it? Come
- 22 on. I mean just say yes or no.
- 23 | A. No, but I don't understand why you're trying to make me say
- 24 | that. I cooperated. And whatever is going to be the end
- 25 result is the end result. Like I don't have any control over

- 1 | this anymore.
- 2 Q. Are you hoping --
- $3 \parallel A$. As of November 29th that's it. I don't sell cigarettes.
- 4 | I'm a cooperating witness. And I'm here testifying to you.
- 5 | Like I don't know what else you want me to say.
- 6 Q. I just want you to answer the question. You're hoping that
- 7 at the end --
- 8 A. I don't know what he can do. I don't really know what he
- 9 could do to be honest with you. I don't know what -- at this
- 10 point, I don't know anything. All I know is that I'm here
- 11 cooperating; and in the end, I'm going to be sentenced. And
- 12 | whatever the sentence is, is what I got to deal with.
- 13 | Q. Let me -- can I show you your plea agreement. Maybe this
- 14 | will cut it --
- 15 A. Sure. Show me whatever you want.
- 16 | Q. Look at paragraph 6 of your plea agreement, sir. Would you
- 17 | read it.
- 18 A. If, in the sole opinion of the United States Attorney, the
- 19 defendant has provided substantial assistance in the
- 20 | investigation or prosecution of another person while -- who has
- 21 committed an offense, the Government will file a Section 5K1
- 22 motion for sentencing guidelines reduction.
- 23 Q. A sentencing reduction; right?
- 24 A. Okay.
- 25 | Q. So in the sole discretion of Mr. Stein and the Government

as to whether or not you've cooperated, you might get a 1 sentencing reduction. Is that a fair statement? 2 A. Yes, it's fair. 3 Q. Okay. All right. That's all I was trying to get out of 4 5 you, sir. A. But I'm not a lawyer. Like I don't know what that means. 6 7 I don't know Section 5K1. I don't know. Well, you know what a sentencing reduction is, don't you? 8 It sounds like you'll have less of a sentence. 9 10 MR. STEIN: Your Honor --11 BY MR. BECK: 12 Q. Yeah, it's common sense. 13 MR. BECK: I'm sorry. 14 THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. Beck. 15 MR. STEIN: It's mischaracterizing the cooperation 16 agreement in that he's talking about a 5K1, and this witness is 17 not eligible for a 5K and can never get a 5K. And so that he 18 is suggesting -- and the witness doesn't know what he's talking 19 about so -- the witness has said he doesn't know, and that in 20 the end it is up to the Court. That's his understanding. 21 THE COURT: Why is it in the plea agreement if he's 22 not eligible? 23 MR. STEIN: The 5K1, it's a boilerplate agreement 24 that the option is open if he earns it. In this case, you have

to do several things to earn a 5K1 which involves a level of

```
1
   cooperation that this witness is not capable of. And,
   therefore, he is not eliqible to get a 5K1. The United States
 2
 3
   Attorney will not recommend a 5K1. He has never been promised
 4
   a 5K1. And the witness is not mischaracterizing his testimony.
   He's just testifying what it is. And for Mr. Beck to keep
 5
   coming back and say the Government has agreed to do this for
 6
 7
   you -- it's a may, if in the sole discretion of the United
    States he has qualified for 5K1, and he can't qualify for it.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: May I see that plea agreement?
10
             MR. BECK: Yes, Your Honor.
11
              THE COURT: What paragraph are you on, six?
12
             MR. BECK: I believe it's paragraph six, Your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: Mr. Beck.
14
             MR. BECK: Yes, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: Response to the objection, and I'll hand
16
   this back to you.
17
              MR. BECK: Well, Your Honor, all I'm going on is the
   piece of paper that I was provided in discovery. And if
18
19
   there's been another decision by the U.S. attorney that says
20
   he's not going to possibly get this, then I haven't seen it.
21
   And I'm just -- I'm just reading plain English, Your Honor, and
22
    I think this gentleman can understand it too. I mean I don't
23
24
              THE COURT: The objection is overruled. He signed
25
   it, and that's what it says.
```

JOHN FAIRCHILD - REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STEIN

1 BY MR. BECK: Q. So let's just finish this, Mr. Fairchild, with this. 2 Do 3 you agree that in your plea agreement it says, quote, in 4 paragraph 6, "If, in the sole opinion of the United States attorney the defendant has provided substantial assistance in 5 the investigation of prosecution of another person who has 6 7 committed an offense, the Government will file a Section 5K1.1 motion for a sentencing guidelines reduction"? 8 Do you agree with that statement? 9 10 A. I mean what do they mean by substantial? Like I don't --11 what is it? I don't know. I don't know. 12 MR. BECK: That's all the questions I have, Your 13 Honor. 14 THE COURT: Redirect? 15 MR. STEIN: Yes. 16 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. STEIN: 18 Q. Mr. Fairchild, would you look at paragraph 3 of the plea 19 agreement. 20 A. Yes. Q. And just look at it and tell me whether it involves 21 2.2 requiring you to cooperate. 23 A. Yes. It says the defendant will fully cooperate with the 24 office of the United States Attorney and any law enforcement 25 worker working with the United States Attorney Office.

JOHN FAIRCHILD - REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STEIN

- 1 Q. And I'll take that back. And at the time the plea
- 2 agreement -- you went into it, you were represented by counsel?
- 3 A. Yes.
- $4 \parallel Q$. And did your lawyer talk to you about what you had to do in
- 5 terms of cooperating and telling the truth?
- 6 A. We never had the conversation.
- 7 Q. All right. But was -- did -- was it your understanding
- 8 | that the United States Attorney's Office could test your
- 9 credibility by even forcing you to take a polygraph if you
- 10 | wanted to?
- 11 A. I'm sure, yes.
- 12 | Q. And what have you been told relative to cooperation? What
- 13 | have you been told would happen to you if the United States
- 14 | Attorney's Office believed you lied?
- 15 A. I would be in a lot of trouble and the deal would be -- the
- 16 deal would be gone.
- 17 $\|$ Q. And did I -- has it been explained to you what would
- 18 | happen if you told a lie that was not against the defendant --
- 19 I'm sorry -- that was against the defendant and, therefore,
- 20 | in the Government's interest if we found out you lied about
- 21 that?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. What would happen?
- 24 $\|$ A. That would be -- the agreement would be gone. I can't lie
- 25 | in anything against -- or just can't lie.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JOHN FAIRCHILD - REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STEIN

And were you ever expecting any substantial benefit other than being able to tell the Court that you have now come clean and hope that the Government would tell the Court that in our opinion you testified truthfully, but that we were going to leave the sentencing to the discretion of the Court? THE COURT: Before you answer that, counsel, can you all approach? (Bench conference commenced outside the hearing of the jury.) THE COURT: I thought that we had received a motion to continue Mr. Faircloth's sentencing from Mr. Manford. the basis of it, which often is in this sort of situation, is because the defendant is hoping that the Government will agree to make sentencing recommendations under 5K1. That's in this motion as well. So as an officer of the Court, you're telling me that --MR. STEIN: I think --THE COURT: -- that's not on the table? MR. STEIN: Yes. I think that Mr. Manford filed a boilerplate motion and that 5K is not on the table. It is a -this case is a standard cooperation agreement case. He is not going to want to work undercover for us. He is not going to wear a wire. It's a standard -- it's a standard cooperation where we tell you what -- we believe he told the truth and cooperated and ask you to give that whatever consideration you

JOHN FAIRCHILD - REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STEIN

```
1
    believed.
              THE COURT: So it was never discussed with
 2
 3
    Mr. Manford and this defendant through Mr. Manford that he
 4
    would be eligible for -- that the Government may file a 5K1?
              MR. STEIN: I think that -- as I recall that after --
 5
    I did -- this is not a joint motion, but I think it's one that
 6
 7
    says I don't oppose.
 8
              THE COURT: Right.
 9
              MR. BECK: It says --
10
              (Simultaneous speech.)
              MR. STEIN: Oh, did it? Well, I think if you call
11
12
    Craig Manford, he will tell you that I told him that when I did
13
    see it, whoops, this isn't a 5K. This is a standard agreement.
14
    And -- because it's simply not.
15
              THE COURT: Well, I just wanted to bring this to
16
    everyone's attention before this defendant answered your
17
    question. I don't want him to be led into answering --
              MR. STEIN: Well, I'm --
18
19
              THE COURT: Giving an answer that may not be --
20
              MR. STEIN: -- not leading. I'm asking what his
    understanding of his plea agreement is.
21
22
              MR. STONE:
                          Judge, it's also problematic --
23
              THE COURT: I can't hear you, Mr. Stone.
24
              MR. STONE:
                          It's problematic that the Government
25
    would state during an objection that you're not eligible for a
```

JOHN FAIRCHILD - REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STEIN

```
1
    5K.
              MR. STEIN: Well, that only goes to their benefit.
 2
 3
    I'm saying don't tell any lies for me. You're not eligible for
 4
    a 5K.
                          You know, it might be --
 5
              THE COURT:
              MR. STONE:
                          Well, when did he first find out?
 6
 7
              THE COURT:
                          This --
              MR. STONE: Right now during this trial?
 8
 9
              THE COURT: Well, it appears as though from the plea
10
    agreement that he signed the pages that says he's eligible to
11
    one, he probably did just find out. That may present a problem
12
    for Mr. Faircloth when we get to his sentencing and whether he
13
    wants to proceed with his plea or not.
              But let's do this because it's getting a little late
14
15
    in the afternoon. Let's go ahead and take a break right now,
16
    and then we'll get back on the record in about ten minutes.
17
        (Bench conference concluded.)
18
              THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to go
19
    ahead and take an afternoon recess. Leave your pads and
20
    pencils on your chairs. Remember don't discuss the case among
21
    yourselves or with anyone else.
22
              Sir, you can step down after the jury has exited.
23
    Just don't discuss your testimony with anyone. Okay?
24
              THE WITNESS:
                            Okay.
25
              THE COURT: Thank you.
```

```
(The jury was excused from the courtroom at 4:24 P.M.)
 1
              THE COURT: All right, counsel, our jury has exited.
 2
 3
    We're going to take about ten, and we'll get back on the
 4
    record.
        (Recess 4:24 P.M. - 4:43 P.M.)
 5
              THE COURT: Please be seated, everyone. We are back
 6
 7
    assembled in the courtroom. We've got our witness on the
    stand, but, sir, I'm going to ask you if you could go wait out
 8
    in the hallway because I think we're going to have a discussion
 9
10
    with Mr. Manford who I understand has arrived in the building.
11
              THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
12
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
13
              (The witness exited the courtroom.)
              THE COURT: Mr. Stein, Ms. Oehlsen, my judicial
14
    assistant, told me that you had called Mr. Manford to get him
15
16
    to come over here, and he's here now?
17
              MR. STEIN: Yes, I --
              THE COURT: All right. Before we hear from him, I
18
19
    checked the book on 5K in the guidelines, and I didn't see any
20
    reason in and of itself why this witness would not qualify for
21
    a reduction. There may be some internal thought process that
22
    your office goes through in deciding whether to file the motion
23
    and nothing starts until the motion is filed, but I believe to
24
    tell the jury that flat out that he doesn't qualify may not
25
   have been accurate. But if Mr. Manford is here, having said
```

```
1
   that, why don't we have him come on in, and we'll find out from
   him what the deal is in this -- in the witness's case.
 2
 3
              You can have a seat, Mr. Stein.
 4
             MR. STEIN: I'm sorry?
              THE COURT: You can have a seat.
 5
              (Craig Manford entered the courtroom.)
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Manford.
 8
             MR. MANFORD: Hi, Judge.
 9
              THE COURT: Hi. You can have a seat wherever you're
10
   comfortable. If you're comfortable back there behind the -- do
11
   you need the headset?
12
             MR. MANFORD: You know, that would be of great
13
   assistance.
14
              THE COURT: Okay. Come on up and get that.
15
              I understand that Mr. Stein called you to appear --
16
   whoops, he's not ready yet. Let me know.
17
             MR. MANFORD: It's on right now.
              THE COURT: It's not working? Come on up.
18
19
             MR. MANFORD: Where do you want me, Judge?
20
              THE COURT: Is it -- it's not working?
21
             MR. MANFORD: Sort of. Where do you want me?
2.2
              THE COURT: Wherever you can hear me.
23
             MR. MANFORD: I can hear you.
24
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. First of all, I
25
   understand Mr. Stein asked you to come over here in the middle
```

```
of our trial, and I appreciate your --
 1
             MR. MANFORD: Oh, no problem.
 2
 3
              THE COURT: -- accommodating us.
 4
             MR. MANFORD: I was just down at the Judicial Center.
   I was walking out the door.
 5
              THE COURT: Okay. So lucky for us. Thank you though
 6
 7
    in any event. Did he tell you why he called you?
              MR. MANFORD: What I can get from Mr. Stein was
 8
   clarification on our agreement and something to do with 5K.
 9
10
              THE COURT: Right. Did he tell you what he thought
11
   the 5K was about in this case?
12
             MR. MANFORD: Yes. He -- and I told him -- well, he
13
   asked me if that's what I thought. You know, our 5K is for
   testimony in trial and grand jury. We're not working as a
14
15
   confidential informant or anything like that.
16
              THE COURT: Right. Well, let me back up.
17
             MR. MANFORD: Okay.
              THE COURT: First of all, I would have wished that I
18
19
   would have gotten to have asked you this question without
20
   having someone else tell you what they thought it was about in
21
   your client's case. But that -- and I'm sorry that you were
2.2
   put on the spot --
23
             MR. MANFORD: Okay.
24
              THE COURT: -- by Mr. Stein. What do you think --
25
   and let me back up and this is why we stopped -- before I ask
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

this question. This is why we stopped your client's testimony here on the stand because what you didn't hear when you were not here is that Mr. Beck got into the usual cross examination of a witness in a case who's testifying in the Government's case in chief but was under indictment and has pled and is awaiting sentencing after the trial. Mr. Beck got into that usual line of cross examination. And he presented your client with a plea agreement, paragraph 6 of which -- I believe it's 6; I think Mr. Beck may have it there -- talked about 5K1. And that brought an objection from the Government. And Mr. Stein told me while the jury was here that your client wasn't eligible for 5K1. And I wasn't certain how to take that, but what I was certain of is I didn't want your client to answer Mr. Stein's questions, being led into an answer under oath, so I thought we'd get to the bottom of it without him here and hear from you because I know that fairly recently you filed a motion to continue your client's sentencing. And it said it was a joint motion. And part of that motion relayed to the Court that he was -- that we were anticipating his testimony in this trial against Ms. Myers and Ms. Lindquist, and that it appeared from the context of the motion that 5K was on the table. Now, Mr. Stein told me and counsel at sidebar that

perhaps that wasn't the case. That it was just your

boilerplate motion. So going into this plea -- and perhaps we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

```
should approach here now and just have this discussion on the
record just with counsel. I know your client is testifying so
-- and it's been an open trial, but in any event, let's have
everyone approach.
          THE CLERK: I don't know how the headphones are going
to work with the white noise.
          THE COURT: We don't need a white noise.
         THE CLERK: Okay.
          THE COURT: We'll just keep our voices down because
everybody has heard this discussion during the trial anyway.
          THE CLERK: Okay.
    (Bench conference commenced outside the hearing of the
    jury.)
          THE COURT: What's your understanding of the deal
your client has as it pertains to cooperation?
         MR. MANFORD: Okay. Whether --
         THE CLERK: Judge --
         THE COURT:
                     I'm sorry.
         THE CLERK: Hold on for one second.
          THE COURT REPORTER: Nothing comes through without
the white noise.
          THE CLERK: Nothing comes through without the white
noise. Let's try it and see what happens.
         MR. MANFORD: I think that when I'm here, I can jack
up the hearing aid, and I'll be fine.
```

```
1
              THE CLERK: You can do that? Okay.
              THE COURT: But I think Kate said if we don't have
 2
 3
   the white noise on, she can't hear.
 4
              THE CLERK: No, if we have the white noise on, she
   can hear through the headphones.
 5
              THE COURT REPORTER: The headphones only work with
 6
 7
   the white noise.
              THE CLERK: Only with the white noise.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: Can you hear him without the headphones
10
   if we don't have the white noise on?
11
              THE COURT REPORTER: Not when he's facing you.
   he's facing you -- not -- go ahead. We'll try.
12
13
              THE COURT: Okay. And if it doesn't work, Kate, then
14
   we'll try again.
15
             MR. MANFORD: All right.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. What's your understanding?
17
             MR. MANFORD: All right. So my understanding is --
              THE COURT: No, Kate? Not working.
18
19
              (Open court.)
20
              THE COURT: Okay, everybody. We're going to ask
   everybody who is here in attendance of the trial to go ahead
21
2.2
   and wait in the hall. That doesn't mean the lawyers that are
   here for the case or the defendants of course. They can remain
23
24
   at counsel table.
25
              (Courtroom cleared.)
```

1 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Almost there. What's your understanding? 2 3 MR. MANFORD: Okay, Judge, you know I come from 4 mostly a state court background. Okay. THE COURT: Can you hear him now, Kate? 5 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. MR. MANFORD: Okay. So my understanding was a 8 9 typical situation where my client is going to give testimony in 10 this trial and grand jury, all right, and be part of the -- a 11 witness for the prosecution. And of course in consideration 12 for that, there would be sentencing recommendations made if he 13 actually, you know, put himself out there on the line and then 14 testified. And we -- this whole -- my client got arrested one 15 night. Was brought in. And I was there with him in the middle 16 of the night. That's when this all came about. He got caught 17 with goods. Okay. 18 And so it was my understanding -- whatever we call 5K 19 or boilerplate -- whatever it was, is -- I mean he wasn't going 20 to be a confidential informant or anything like that. He was 21 going to provide testimony here and assist the Government in 2.2 their prosecution of these people. And depending on if he 23 actually did that that would -- the Government may make some 24 sentencing recommendations. I mean he's got tons of relevant 25 conduct and dollar-wise in tax loss and tax revenue. So that

```
1
   was my understanding. If that -- I'm not trying to get anybody
   in trouble. I'm just trying to be honest with the Court.
 2
 3
              THE COURT: No. That's what we -- that's what I
 4
   asked you to tell me. And the 5K paragraph in the plea
   agreement?
 5
             MR. MANFORD: Isn't that substantial assistance?
 6
 7
             THE COURT: Yes.
 8
             MR. MANFORD: Isn't that just generally what I just
 9
   said we would do is just --
10
              THE COURT: Yes, without being -- yes.
11
             MR. MANFORD: Yeah. Without --
12
             THE COURT: Yes. Without being -- wearing a wire.
13
             MR. MANFORD: Yeah. Exactly. And none of that was
14
   never contemplated.
15
             MR. STEIN: Your Honor --
16
              THE COURT: You see, Mr. Stein, to be eligible for
17
    5K, you don't have to wear a wire and buy any dope. You can --
18
   your assistance can be whatever it is and then the Government
19
   decides.
20
             MR. STEIN: No.
                              That is not the policy of either --
21
              (Court reporter indicated to speak up.)
22
             MR. STEIN: I'm sorry. That is not the policy of any
23
   United States Attorney's Office that I know of. There are two
24
    types of cooperation.
25
              THE COURT: Didn't we have substantial assistance in
```

one of these cigarette cases that didn't involve a wire? MR. STEIN: 2 No. 3 THE COURT: No? 4 MR. STEIN: There was always some undercover work, and they went in and they did something. If you will remember, 5 when I talked about Mr. -- whose sentencing was it that I 6 7 compared to O'Connell as the gold standard? These were all people who actually wore wires and went undercover. 8 9 THE COURT: Then why doesn't it say that in the 10 guidelines? Why doesn't it say you have to wear a wire to be 11 eligible for 5K1? 12 MR. STEIN: Well, it doesn't necessarily have to wear 13 a wire. You have to do something other than just in-court testimony or grand jury testimony. That's your base. And 5K, 14 15 in order to get it, you have to -- not only do you have to do 16 something, you have to do it to such an extent that it is 17 successful and that as a result of it, someone will either be 18 indicted or, if not, it's sufficient evidence that we could 19 actually charge somebody. And if you don't bring that much to 20 the table, you don't get 5K. And that's -- and both Mr. Beck 21 and Mr. Stone, as experienced practitioners in this district, I 22 will be shocked if they say they ever had a client get a 5K for 23 just in-court testimony because it doesn't happen. It is --24 I've been in this office since '88. It has never happened. 25 the Southern District I believe it is the exact same rule. I

```
1
    don't -- and when I was in Texas, it was the rule. I know of
    no district at all that doesn't treat it that way.
 2
 3
              MR. BECK: Your Honor, I --
 4
              MR. STONE: Judge --
              MR. BECK: Go ahead.
 5
              MR. STONE: Go ahead.
 6
 7
              MR. BECK: Well, I was just going to say -- I've been
    doing this so long I can't remember everybody I ever
 8
 9
    represented, but I can tell you that I have been to conferences
10
    where I met fellow defense attorneys, and they laugh when I
11
    tell them how it is here because they say in their
12
    jurisdiction, they give out these 5Ks like candy. If you show
13
    up and testify at trial, you get one. So it varies among the
14
    jurisdictions. So whether they've done it here or not, I can't
15
    verify that.
16
              THE COURT: Well, do you have that plea agreement?
17
              MR. BECK: Yes, Your Honor.
18
              THE COURT: Mr. Stone.
19
              MR. STONE: Judge, I think the problem is we have
20
    injected into the trial I'm yanking the rug out from under your
    feet. You're not eligible for a 5K. Which apparently is
21
2.2
    inconsistent with what Mr. Fairchild's lawyer understood his
23
    eligibility to be.
24
              THE COURT:
                          That's my problem.
25
              MR. STONE:
                          That's a problem.
```

```
1
              THE COURT:
                          That's a problem because we've had an
 2
    officer of the Court stand up in front of this jury and say
 3
    this witness is not eligible for a 5K, but it's in his plea
 4
    agreement. The plea agreement that he signed with his attorney
    on each and every page. And paragraph 6 on page 3,
 5
   Mr. Manford, "If, in the sole opinion of the United States
 6
 7
    Attorney, the defendant has provided substantial assistance in
    the investigation or prosecution of another person who has
 8
    committed an offense, the Government will file a Section 5K1.1
 9
10
    motion for a sentencing guidelines reduction."
11
              Is that the paragraph that you're relying on
12
    regardless of whether it says 5K1 or not?
13
              MR. MANFORD: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Does it mention the defendant's
14
15
    assistance in any other part --
16
              MR. STEIN:
                          Yes.
17
              THE COURT: -- of this plea agreement?
18
              MR. STEIN:
                          Yes, Your Honor, it does.
19
              THE COURT:
                          Where?
20
              MR. STEIN:
                          I'll find it.
21
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
2.2
              MR. STEIN:
                          Paragraph 3.
              THE COURT:
23
                          This talks about fully cooperating;
24
    correct?
25
                                Which is different than substantial
              MR. STEIN:
                          Yes.
```

cooperation.

THE COURT: All right. But it doesn't say the Government is going to do anything in return for it in this paragraph 3; correct? The only place where --

MR. STEIN: Which is what this witness was saying.

THE COURT: It's not what Mr. Manford was saying.

What Mr. Manford -- the words that came out of his mouth was substantial assistance. And paragraph 6 is the only place that

9 | that's mentioned.

And I'm sorry you're on the hot seat, Mr. Manford, because you're kind of in between lawyers. And I know this is a very cordial bar and this ordinarily doesn't happen. But I have a concern that I've got a jury that may have been misled, lawyers that relied upon language in a plea agreement, and they used it on cross examination so now Mr. Beck is going to look like he's somehow been dishonest when he was relying on this. And, more importantly, we've got your client, Mr. Manford, on the stand about ready to answer a question from Mr. Stein leading him into the fact of, well, you weren't -- you had no expectation of the Government filing a 5K1 motion if you cooperated by testifying truthfully in our case in chief.

MR. STEIN: May I address that, Your Honor? The witness said that. He said it on the stand. I don't believe the U.S. Attorney's Office has anything to do with it. My understanding of it is it's just going to go to the judge who

```
1
   has heard me testify. That's exactly what this plea
   agreement -- the defendant has got it right.
 2
 3
              THE COURT: That's the bottom line. That's what I
 4
   heard him say. What he was saying was ultimately it's the
    judge's decision and that's true. But that's not -- that's not
 5
   where Mr. Beck was going with this. And he was led to believe
 6
 7
   there was an expectation on behalf of the defendant, if he did
   everything -- or this witness as a defendant in his own case,
 8
 9
   if he did everything that was expected of him, the Government
10
   will file a 5K1 motion. He led him through that testimony.
11
   And then you stand up and object and say, Your Honor, he
12
   doesn't qualify for 5K. Well, in and of itself, that's not
13
   true.
14
                          It is true because first of all, the
              MR. STEIN:
15
   witness has said he wasn't. But that -- it says within the
16
    sole discretion of the United States Attorney's Office --
17
              THE COURT: Right.
18
              MR. STEIN: -- and I am saying that that sole
19
   discretion is never going to be exercised for a 5K in a purely
20
    testimonial witness.
21
              THE COURT:
                          Then why was it in the plea agreement
22
    which was signed November 2017?
23
             MR. STEIN: Because --
24
             THE COURT: Why?
25
             MR. STEIN: It is boilerplate. It either goes in or
```

```
1
   goes out. And it's up -- and when we talked about it -- some
   defense lawyers want it in. Some defense lawyers want it out.
 2
 3
   And --
 4
              THE COURT: Did you ask for that to be in there,
   Mr. Manford?
 5
             MR. MANFORD: Well, I sure was glad to see it.
 6
 7
    just trying to be honest. Yeah, I --
              THE COURT: No, I understand. Were the nuances of
 8
 9
   this discussed with you? It's in there, but it's meaningless.
10
   Have your client sign it.
11
             MR. STEIN: The reason why I --
12
              THE COURT: No. I'm asking Mr. Manford. Were the
13
   nuances of this --
14
             MR. MANFORD: The truth is no. I thought 5K was
15
   substantial assistance. I'm not trying to get anybody in
16
   trouble.
17
             THE COURT: Right.
18
             MR. MANFORD: I'm still trying to protect my client.
19
   But I did not -- you know, I thought this -- my understanding
   was this would be substantial assistance. I'm sorry. That's
20
21
   it.
22
             THE COURT: Okay.
23
             MR. MANFORD: That's it.
24
             THE COURT: And that's what you told your client?
25
             MR. MANFORD: Yes.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
MR. STEIN: Your Honor, the reason why I called
Mr. Manford, and he is going to -- I believe he will say I'm
correct in what I'm about to say -- is that when he filed --
this motion was suggested that it was a joint motion that I
actually participated in. But when the motion was filed, I
looked at it afterwards, and I called him and said, no, this
isn't a 5K. You'll get our recommendation but not under 5K.
And so I -- and so to the extent that we're saying, oh, you
signed this joint motion, I didn't. It was -- I had agreed --
when Craig wanted to get a continuance to allow his client to
testify, I said, well, I'll join in that to give him an
opportunity to testify. And then when he filed it saying 5K, I
called him and said this isn't a 5K case. This is a regular
cooperation case. And he said okay. And we were going to take
it from there.
          THE COURT: Do you recall that conversation,
Mr. Manford? I'm sorry you're on the spot, but do you recall
it?
         MR. MANFORD: All right. Look, folks, I don't recall
    He could have. You know my practice. I'm in court --
it.
          THE COURT: Yes.
         MR. MANFORD: -- four or five hearings a day.
could have done it. I don't have a recollection of that. But
he's never lied to me -- you know, I don't know.
possible. But I would think -- I'm sorry. I would think I
```

```
1
   would remember it if we had that conversation. But I'm not --
   it's possible.
 2
 3
              THE COURT: Let me ask you this. If you had had that
 4
   conversation with Mr. Stein before your client testified, would
   you have discussed that with your client then after he signed
 5
   this plea agreement?
 6
 7
             MR. MANFORD: Well, you would hope I would, yeah.
              THE COURT: Right. And I imagine you would have.
 8
 9
   All right. And I am sorry you're on the spot.
10
             MR. MANFORD: Is what it is, Judge.
11
              THE COURT: Yeah. Is there any reason that we need
12
   Mr. Manford to stick around --
13
             MR. STEIN: No.
              THE COURT: -- any further, gentlemen?
14
15
             MR. BECK: No, Your Honor.
16
             MR. STEIN:
                         No.
17
              THE COURT: Okay. We can have argument without you.
18
   Thank you for making yourself available and, again, I am sorry
19
   we had to put you on the spot.
20
             MR. MANFORD: I'm sorry to everybody. I don't know
21
    -- I -- anyway.
2.2
              THE COURT: No, yours is -- there is no apology for
23
   you to make, Mr. Manford.
24
             MR. MANFORD: All right. Thanks, Judge.
25
              THE COURT: Thank you.
```

```
(Mr. Manford was excused.)
 1
              (Bench conference concluded.)
 2
 3
              THE COURT: Mr. Beck, this is yours before I stuff it
 4
    somewhere. This plea agreement.
              MR. STEIN: Your Honor, may I address the point that
 5
   Mr. Stone made about the potential prejudice?
 6
 7
              THE COURT: There's a lot of potential prejudice.
    But let's -- Mr. Stone, make the point again.
 8
 9
              THE CLERK: Do you want the parties back in?
10
              THE COURT: Oh, yeah. We can bring everyone back in
11
    to this.
12
              MR. STEIN: His point was that because I told the
13
    witness that he was not eligible that somehow hurt his client's
14
    case.
15
              THE COURT: No. You stood up to begin with and told
16
   me, in lodging your objection against somewhere Mr. Beck was
17
    going with his cross examination with this plea agreement, this
18
    witness is not eligible.
19
              MR. STEIN: Yes. Yes. I'm agreeing with that, Your
20
    Honor.
            I --
21
              THE COURT: Okay.
22
                          I'm saying Mr. Stone is saying that my
              MR. STEIN:
23
    statement prejudices his client. And I was going to address
24
    that statement.
25
              THE COURT: Mr. Stone, can you put it upon the
```

record.

2.2

MR. STONE: Well, Judge, I think what we were saying is that I believe I referenced 5K on my cross of Mr. Fairchild. I believe I referenced that to some extent. I didn't go into it in detail. But, you know, obviously the inference to be made is -- and I think he acknowledged it to some extent. He's here because he's got to be here, and he's hoping to get some kind of benefit out of it. And with Mr. Beck's cross examination, properly questioning him about what we had in writing -- because we had not been informed that there had been any subsequent discussions that, you know, Fairchild -- the 5K is off the table for him. I mean given the fact that he met with them, he testified before a grand jury, and he's here before a trial, typically I would envision that would be someone eligible for a 5K or a very favorable sentencing recommendation.

THE COURT: Sounds like he and his attorney thought so from what Mr. Manford told us.

MR. STONE: And anymore -- I mean in the old days I guess when the guidelines were mandatory, you had to have a 5K. But nowadays the guidelines are advisory. So if you get a favorable recommendation from the Government, it's almost analogous to a 5K. I mean if the Government makes a favorable recommendation --

THE COURT: We need Mr. Fairchild to remain outside.

```
1
   If you could, Mr. Fairchild, we'll get you, sir. Is he out --
   is he still out there?
 2
 3
              (Simultaneous speech.)
 4
              THE COURT: Okay. I should wear my glasses.
 5
   you.
             MR. STONE:
                          The problem is -- and, again, I mean
 6
 7
   maybe we should have had a bench conference for the objection
   rather than --
 8
 9
              THE COURT:
                          There --
10
             MR. STONE: -- discussing it --
11
              THE COURT: There should have been a bench conference
12
   when the first mention of 5K was out of either one of your
13
   mouths, Mr. Stone or Mr. Beck, before you went down that road
14
   relying upon what was in that plea agreement in black and
15
   white, signed by the witness and his attorney.
16
             MR. STONE: But the -- I mean the problem is now
17
   we've -- we have injected, you know, well, you're never getting
18
   a 5K. You're not eligible. And --
19
              THE COURT: We didn't inject. We didn't know.
20
             MR. STONE: So now --
21
              THE COURT: We interjected the Government saying he's
22
   not eligible, this wasn't the agreement, is what we've
23
    interjected because Mr. Manford didn't say that.
24
             MR. STONE: Right. So -- I mean I don't -- I mean I
25
   think it's problematic, Judge. I mean because, again -- I mean
```

```
1
    I'd be shocked if Mr. Fairchild truly doesn't believe that he's
    not eliqible for a 5K. That might be the first time he heard
 2
 3
    about it today.
 4
              THE COURT: And let's put another layer on this.
   He's yet to be sentenced.
 5
              MR. STEIN:
                          Right.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: And he's under oath.
 8
              MR. STEIN: Right.
 9
              THE COURT: And I'm the judge that's going to
10
    sentence him.
11
              MR. STEIN: Right.
12
              THE COURT:
                          So it's going to be very hard for me to
13
    believe if he sits here and he says, oh, no -- when you ask him
14
    a leading question -- I had no idea that the Government wasn't
15
    going to file a 5K1 motion if I did my part, and I gave you all
16
    this truthful testimony because it's in his plea agreement that
17
   he signed. That's the only place it talks about the Government
18
    asking for him to be cut a break for cooperation. So it puts
19
    him in a really bad spot. Talk about prejudice.
20
              MR. STEIN: The question -- I think we're missing --
    I've been trying to address Mr. Stone's -- what I thought he
21
22
    was saying was that his client is prejudiced by it. And I --
23
              THE COURT: That's what he's saying. But I'm saying
24
    there's another layer here --
25
              MR. STEIN: I understand. But I'd --
```

```
(Simultaneous speech.)
 1
              MR. STEIN: -- like to do it one at a time.
 2
 3
              THE COURT:
                         Okay.
 4
             MR. STEIN: So I would first like to address that his
   client is being prejudiced. And I would say that there cannot
 5
   possibly be prejudice because this witness has now heard that
 6
 7
   in the Government's version he -- well, he would get in our
   version -- this hasn't been explained to him, but it's his
 8
   understanding anyway that he's not going to get 5K. That very
 9
10
    limited thing.
11
              Now, the defendant -- now that he knows that -- and
12
    if the defense asks him if he wants to change his mind about
13
   anything and testify, he's still under oath. He is fine. He
14
   can testify that, oh, now that I'm not getting -- I'm not doing
15
   anything for the Government, well, yeah, the defendants are all
16
   not guilty if he wants to. Because I just told him that it --
17
   but that's not true.
              THE COURT:
18
                          The toothpaste is out of the tube at this
19
   point with --
20
              MR. STEIN: Not for him.
              THE COURT: -- his testimony. It's not going back
21
22
        He can't change his testimony now. He's under oath.
23
              MR. STEIN: Well, why can't he change his testimony?
24
              THE COURT: Because then he would be a liar in your
25
   estimation, and then you could prosecute him for perjury. So
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

16

17

18

19

21

he's -- there's no way he's changing his testimony now. The toothpaste is out of the tube. MR. STEIN: No. THE COURT: He's smart enough. He told us he's been a criminal his whole life. He's not going to even attempt to put it back in and change direction. MR. STEIN: Well, I would just stand then on the fact that his testimony is accurate. His testimony is exactly what we told him in debriefings. That this is all going to come down to the judge. If he testifies and we believe he's testifying truthfully, we will tell the judge that we think he 12 testified truthfully and ask the Court to give it the consideration that the Court deems appropriate. And that's 14 what he essentially said. And that is his understanding of the 15 agreement, and it actually is the agreement even though it has another clause that's not applicable to him. He was exactly right which is why I was getting upset. And maybe I shouldn't have gotten upset, but I was getting upset because in my view, both Mr. Beck and Mr. Stone know that there's not going to be a 20 5K in this, and they're thinking he's lying. And --THE COURT: Well, let's ask them. Mr. Beck, did you 22 stand up here and cross examine this witness knowing that he is 23 not going to get a 5K? 24 MR. BECK: I did not, Your Honor. And, you know -- I 2.5 did not, Your Honor.

```
MR. STEIN:
                          But --
 1
 2
              THE COURT:
                          How about you, Mr. Stone?
 3
             MR. STEIN:
                          I'm sorry.
 4
             MR. STONE: No, Your Honor. And, again, my
   understanding of eligibility for a 5K is similar to what
 5
   Mr. Manford said. I mean the days of you got to go make a buy,
 6
 7
   I mean I don't -- I kind of disagree with that. I don't think
   that that's an absolute mandate anymore and, again, the
 8
   guidelines aren't mandatory. It's a whole different thing now
 9
10
   with regard to sentencing. I mean the Government can make a
11
    sentencing recommendation or say we don't oppose the
12
   defendant's request, and it's almost like a 5K without formally
13
   filing it. I mean, I -- I mean his lawyer said that's how he
14
   understood it. And to say that Mr. Fairchild understands it
15
   differently than his lawyer, I mean I don't know --
16
              THE COURT: And Mr. -- here's my problem, too,
17
   Mr. Stein. Mr. Manford is on the A-list of criminal defense
   attorneys here in federal court and in state court. If he --
18
19
   what he understood the plea agreement to be is exactly what I
20
   would expect he would have relayed to his client. So
21
   Mr. Manford and Mr. Fairchild clearly have a meeting of the
2.2
   minds on what they thought -- between the two of them what they
23
   thought the plea agreement --
24
             MR. STEIN: Your Honor --
25
              THE COURT: -- was going to be because Mr. Manford
```

```
1
    would have advised him whether he should take the plea or not
    and discussed that plea agreement with him. Mr. Manford, if he
 2
 3
    thought that substantial assistance and the benefit to be
 4
    obtained from the Government as it was written in that
    paragraph 6 of the plea agreement that they both read and
 5
    signed meant one thing, then that's what he told his client.
 6
 7
    And that's what I would have expected then the client would
    believe what --
 8
 9
              MR. STEIN: Regardless --
10
              THE COURT: -- his lawyer told him.
              MR. STEIN: -- of what he told his client, his client
11
12
    wouldn't have testified the way he did because his client
13
    didn't testify that I believe that there was a 5K. His client
14
    testified that he thought that his obligation was to tell the
15
    truth and that the United States Attorney's Office was going to
16
    tell the judge something, but it was ultimately up to the
17
    judge. That was what he said his understanding is.
18
              THE COURT: And he also mentioned something, did he
19
    not -- and I did not write it down so it's not in my notes.
20
    But I thought he said something about he referred to a
    calculation.
21
2.2
              MR. STEIN: Yeah, he was talking about the
23
    guidelines.
24
              THE COURT: Uh-huh.
25
              MR. STEIN:
                          That's what I thought.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

```
THE COURT: And he said he was going to basically --
and I'm summarizing -- receive some benefit on a recommendation
from the Government that there would be a reduction in that
calculation.
         MR. STEIN:
                     Exactly.
          THE COURT:
                      That's a 5K.
         MR. STEIN: No, that's a normal --
          THE COURT:
                     That's not a, Your Honor, we're
requesting that you variant sentence --
         MR. STEIN:
                      No.
          THE COURT: -- this defendant under the --
         MR. STEIN:
                     I'm not asking --
          THE COURT:
                     -- quidelines.
         MR. STEIN: -- for variance. Your Honor, that is the
normal in-court recommendation. It's not 5K. It's paragraph
3.
          THE COURT: I -- the normal recommendation absent a
5K from the Government is, Your Honor, we recommend that you
sentence the defendant at the low end of the guidelines.
         MR. STEIN: On 5K?
          THE COURT:
                      That's not -- no, not on a 5K.
         MR. STEIN:
                      Right.
          THE COURT: What you just said to me was he was
talking about the normal calculations of the -- the normal
recommendation I think is what you just said to me. And, no,
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
the normal recommendation of the Government -- because I
sentence all the time -- is absent a 5K, the Government stands
up, if they have an agreement with the defendant, and they say,
Your Honor, in accordance with our agreement, we ask that you
sentence this defendant at the low end of the quidelines.
          That doesn't -- that's not at the point where we're
calculating. This witness out of his own mouth had an
understanding there was going to be some recommendation by the
Government for a reduction in the calculation of his
quidelines. That's a 5K.
         MR. STEIN: Your Honor, in other contraband cigarette
cases -- I'll ask someone with a better memory than I am to
tell you exactly which it was -- we had a defendant in a
similar situation as Mr. Fairchild. The Government made a
recommendation of the low end. And during that recommendation,
the Government went on to say how -- just how cooperative the
defendant was, and this Court varied below the low end.
          THE COURT: For a reduced -- for a sentence below --
         MR. STEIN: The guideline.
          THE COURT: -- the guidelines.
          (Simultaneous speech.)
         MR. STEIN: But it wasn't a motion under 5K.
just a --
          THE COURT: No, it wasn't. But I don't think it was
made at the time I calculated the guidelines either --
```

```
1
             MR. STEIN: Yes, it -- you had already calculated the
 2
   quidelines.
 3
              THE COURT: Right.
 4
             MR. STEIN: And you gave him a sentence of less than
   that when I went on and on about how cooperative the witness
 5
   was. And it was a paragraph 3 recommendation just like
 6
 7
   Mr. Fairchild would get in this case.
              THE COURT: But I don't think that's Mr. Fairchild's
 8
 9
   understanding --
10
              MR. STEIN: But it's exactly his understanding.
11
   That's what he said. We should have the court reporter read
12
   back what he said.
13
              THE COURT:
                          She's not going to do that.
14
             MR. STEIN:
                          Okay. But --
15
              THE COURT: And -- but that wasn't what Mr. Manford
16
    said so I don't see how he -- Mr. Manford could have thought
17
   one thing and his client thinks another.
18
              MR. STEIN: Well, for one thing, Mr. Manford has
19
   elected not to attend all the debriefings. And in every
20
    debriefing, we routinely tell the witness that it's his
21
   obligation to tell the truth and that at the end of the day, he
22
   must tell the truth. If he lies, essentially he's dead meat.
   But if he tells the truth, we'll tell the Court about it. But
23
24
   at the end of the day, it's up to the Court. And we tell every
25
   witness that whether the lawyer is there or not. And we're
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

really adamant with our witnesses you've got to tell the truth, and it's up to the judge. And then the judge is the one who is going to view your credibility. So it really doesn't matter what I say. If the judge doesn't believe that you're telling the truth, you're not going to get it. If the judge believes you're telling the truth, pretty much no matter what I say, you're going to get it. It's up to the judge who will make these determinations. And we tell this to every witness. THE COURT: Regardless of whether they are anticipating a 5K1 motion or not? MR. STEIN: Well, no, it is different with --THE COURT: Because if you testify, you got to --MR. STEIN: People who are really expecting a 5K like -- well, I don't want to say it in open court, but there are a few of them out there. They have a different thing. again, a, they know that in addition to the cooperation, they must do something. In the most recent one that you know about is setting up wearing a wire and doing it and that he's not going to get a 5K unless it's successful. He knows that. His attorneys know that. And if that fails, it has nothing to do with what his cooperation was testimonially. But he's actually on a double track. He wants to give testimony as well. But they're separate. The 5K is going to work for the Government. And maybe they're right that some districts give them away like candy, but neither this district nor the Southern District does

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that. It's an absolute requirement that not only do they have to do something more than just testify in court, they have got to be successful. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stein. Mr. Stone. Judge, I guess I've said everything I can MR. STONE: I just don't know how we kind of unring that bell. You know that's problematic I think. THE COURT: Mr. Beck. MR. BECK: Your Honor, the only thing I would say is -- and I don't need to tell you or anyone else who knows Mr. Manford -- he's probably a better lawyer than I am and one of the best lawyers here in town. And if he had that understanding, then I don't think it's fair for Mr. Stein to say there's some blanket rule that he -- that in this district that he had to make a controlled buy or something. So I'm like Mr. Stone. I don't see how we can unring this bell, Your Honor. I see a couple options here. If the Court wants to hear what I think, I'll --THE COURT: Go ahead. MR. BECK: I don't do this lightly. I am moving the Court to dismiss the case for Government misconduct. This jury has been poisoned, and there's no other remedy that will be fair to my client. The last thing we want to do is try this case again. So a mistrial would be prejudicial to her. She's already been through a nightmare long enough. I am moving for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a mistrial, Your Honor -- or not a mistrial but dismissal on the grounds of Government misconduct. THE COURT: Mr. Stone. MR. STONE: Judge, I mean I think I have to agree with Mr. Beck. I mean we're -- you know, I think Mr. Stein made a mistake. And it should have been handled at bench conference. But this is out there now. And they were listening pretty intently to all that. And, you know, I mean we're well into this trial. This is our fourth day into this trial. But, you know, we didn't bring this about ourselves. THE COURT: Can we cure it? MR. BECK: I don't see how, Your Honor, because it's going to have to be involved somebody telling the jury that Mr. Stein misrepresented the truth to them. And I don't know how that's going to -- I don't know how that would work first of all. So I don't see how it can be fixed, Your Honor. You know, the only options I see are dismissal for Government misconduct or mistrial, and I would beg the Court not to grant a mistrial because -- at least I don't think we want a mistrial because this thing is just -- we don't want to -- yeah. So those are my positions, Your Honor. THE COURT: I guess the problem is -- because my initial thought was to instruct the jury that they had to

disregard the statement that he wasn't eligible for the 5K.

```
1
              MR. STEIN: May I address the curing of it, Your
 2
    Honor?
 3
              THE COURT: Yes, sir.
 4
              MR. STEIN: And I would also like to address my
    conduct. On the merits, I would say that the Court -- and the
 5
    Government won't object to this -- and say that there was a
 6
 7
    good-faith misunderstanding among counsel; and that as a pure
    matter of law, the witness is entitled to a 5K reduction.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: I can't say there was a misunderstanding.
10
              MR. STEIN: Well, there is. They think it's one way.
    I think it's another. We still have this real disagreement
11
12
    about in good -- I believe that Mr. Beck is in good faith.
13
    believe that Mr. Stone is in good faith. If they want to stand
14
    up and say that they really believe I am in bad faith about
15
    what I believe is going on, let them say it. But I don't think
16
    they're going to say I'm in bad faith. I think that we just
17
    saw it completely differently and have our honest difference
    about what this is.
18
19
              And if you will let me say one thing about the
20
    merits -- I mean my conduct, I would appreciate the
21
    opportunity.
2.2
              THE COURT: Absolutely.
23
              MR. STEIN:
                          In my way of thinking and from my
24
    perspective -- I've grown up and why I'm a lawyer is that one
25
    of the things that I think is very important in the criminal
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

justice system is that witnesses who are telling the truth shouldn't be beaten up and badgered for telling the truth. I believe that Mr. Fairchild was telling the truth when he said his understanding was that -- exactly how he said that it wasn't up to the United States Attorney's Office and that he was just going to testify, and it was going to be up to the judge at the end of the day. And so that's why I said what I said. But -- and it was just because I thought, from my point of view -- and I understand that you probably think I'm wrong -- but I thought that the witness was being treated unfairly by defense counsel. THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Stein. Anything further, Mr. Stone? MR. STONE: Well, Judge, maybe the -- if the Court is not going to grant that motion and try to do a curative instruction, maybe the best way to do it would just be simply say that if the Court instructs the jury that Mr. Fairchild is eligible for a 5K, and we don't have to get into all the other stuff. And then the jury won't probably wonder what the heck is going on. You know, maybe do it that way if the Court is not going to grant Mr. Beck's motion that we joined in. THE COURT: This is the first time I've had to consider an issue like this ever and especially just deciding from the hip.

Mr. Beck, anything further?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

naught.

MR. BECK: Your Honor, regarding the curative instruction -- and this is why I think it gets problematic is because the plea agreement says it's in the opinion of the United States Attorney. What Mr. Stein has told the jury is the United States Attorney has decided this man will never get a 5K. The United States Attorney is in Charleston, West Virginia, and we have been provided with nothing on the record that says a decision like that has been made. So for this Court to correct it, I believe you'd have to tell the jury that Mr. Stein made a statement that the U.S. Attorney has not decided. So I just don't know how to fix it, Your Honor, and that's my concern. And I don't -- I didn't anticipate this would happen. Certainly didn't set it up this way. But we're in this position, and I just think there's only one fair thing to do for Ms. Lindquist. THE COURT: All right, counsel. This is what we're going to do. We're going to end this trial today. And I'm going to consider the arguments made by counsel, review the testimony that we had from this witness along with what Mr. Manford told us when he came in here today. And I'll reserve ruling on Mr. Beck's motion until we meet again tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock. Unfortunately, we'll have to

There is some good news if we continue on with the

have our jury come back tomorrow, and it may or may not be for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
case because Mr. Mullen has been advised that the witness who
couldn't -- I'm sorry, the juror who couldn't be with us any
longer than tomorrow has checked with his boss, and he's not
going out of town now because he wants to finish his service.
And the female juror, who had an operation scheduled for
Wednesday, has moved her operation. So we'll still have a full
12 as well as an alternate. If there's any bright light on
anything that we've discussed today, there you have it.
          I just want to make sure that I give this thoughtful
consideration and really think about everything that I've heard
here this afternoon, counsel.
          So we will go ahead and ask Mr. Mullen to release our
jury unless you want them brought back in here again, counsel.
         MR. BECK: No, Your Honor.
                     That's okay, Your Honor.
         MR. STONE:
          THE COURT: All right. We'll ask them to return
tomorrow morning at 8:00 and tell them that if we promise them
they'd be finished by noon -- because I know the one has to get
some interim grades in so we'll finish by noon tomorrow, and
then we'll pick up on Tuesday with what we have left.
         Anything further on behalf of the Government?
         MR. STEIN:
                     No, Your Honor.
          THE COURT:
                     Anything further, Mr. Stone, on behalf of
your client?
         MR. STONE: No, Your Honor.
```

```
THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Beck?
 1
              MR. BECK: No, Your Honor.
 2
 3
              THE COURT: All right. Defendant is remanded to the
 4
    custody of the United States Marshal.
 5
        (Court was adjourned at 4:30 P.M., continuing the trial to
 6
 7
        November 9, 2018.)
 8
 9
        (The following proceedings were held November 9, 2018, at
10
        8:40 A.M.)
11
12
              THE COURT: Please be seated, everyone. We'll call
13
    our case.
14
              THE CLERK: This is the case of the United States of
15
   America versus Reba Marcelle Myers and Lisa Renee Lindquist.
16
    Criminal number 3:17-cr-70, defendants 1 and 2.
17
              The Government is represented by counsel, Michael
    Stein and Christopher Jackson. The defendants are present in
18
19
   person and by counsel. Robert Stone for Ms. Myers. Barry Beck
20
    and Nicholas Matzureff for Ms. Lindquist.
21
              Are the parties ready to proceed?
22
              MR. STEIN: The United States is ready.
23
              MR. STONE: Mrs. Myers is ready.
24
              MR. BECK: Ms. Lindquist is ready, Your Honor.
25
              THE COURT: All right, counsel. Our jury is here.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They're in the back while we address a motion raised by or made by Mr. Beck at the close of business yesterday. Mr. Beck had made a motion for this case to be dismissed on the basis of prosecutorial misconduct. I preferred, instead of ruling from the hip, to consider the conversation that we had with Mr. Manford, who represents the witness who had been on the stand in this case, to review the arguments that counsel had made with regard to this issue surrounding Mr. Fairchild and his plea and any agreements contained within his plea, and also of equal importance, to review the law that I believed pertained to the concern and the issue raised yesterday here in the middle of this jury trial. So we're here to consider the motion this morning Depending upon the Court's ruling on the motion, if the motion is denied, then we'll proceed to the remainder of the Government's evidence in this case. Mr. Beck, given an evening to think about what transpired and do your own research, would you like to be heard further on your motion? MR. BECK: I would, Your Honor, because I think I've got a more coherent statement to make to the Court now that I have had a chance to think about all of this. THE COURT: I imagine it may have come as a surprise to you during your cross examination of Mr. Fairchild to learn

that the 5K substantial assistance portion of the plea

agreement that you had received along with Mr. Stone was not really on the table.

MR. BECK: It was, Your Honor, and I do want to make a proffer as an officer of the Court with some additional facts that I have obtained since yesterday. This morning I got in my office early and on a lark called the Southern District of West Virginia Federal Public Defender's Office to try to get someone on the line who might be able to enlighten me as to the actual practice in that district with regard to 5K1 motions.

I was lucky. The gentleman came in at 7:30. His name is George Lancaster. I believe he is the senior federal public defender. Not the public defender but the senior assistant federal public defender. I did not have a lot of time to explain to him why I was asking this question. I simply put to him, "Are you aware of any rule in the Southern District of West Virginia where a cooperating defendant will never get a 5K1 motion unless they make controlled buys?"

His answer -- and I'm going to -- this is my proffer,

Your Honor -- was no. It could happen one of three ways. One
is a defendant could make controlled buys. Two is they can
testify in a grand jury and before a trial. And three is they
can refer the Government to someone who can make controlled
buys.

age, in his late 50s, early 60s. He said more often than not my clients fall into category two, that is, the grand jury/trial testimony route because most of my clients are in custody and cannot make controlled buys.

2.5

So I wanted to let the Court know that as an officer of the Court that I'm proffering that's the information I obtained. I can't vouch for Mr. Lancaster, but I have no reason to believe that he's not an experienced attorney given his position with that office.

So given that, Your Honor, I think you're presented with a scenario where the Government had what I would call one of their principal, if not principal, witnesses against my client testify. He provided testimony which at least in some ways implicated my client in the alleged conspiracy.

During my cross examination, I asked him about his incentives for testifying. One of those questions concerned the 5K1 aspect of his plea agreement. I have no -- I mean perfectly proper cross examination. I've done it for years in every criminal case I've been involved in where that was an issue.

During that, the Government objected. And I don't recall the precise words that the Government used, but it was certainly a statement to the jury that this individual could never get a 5K1 motion under any circumstances because he had not made controlled buys. He was not eligible I believe is the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

statement that was made. That statement, as I understand it, is both legally wrong and factually wrong given the information that I have learned today from Mr. Lancaster. The prejudice that -- so it was improper, Your Honor. The prejudice now is that the jury, as it stands, believes that this individual had no reason to provide testimony that was favorable to the Government because his plea agreement would not get him any further benefit. But also more importantly, the jury is left with the impression that I have attempted to play games with them by suggesting that he did when, in fact, according to Mr. Stein, that's not possible. I don't know how to fix this, Your Honor. It seems to me it's gone off the rails, and it's because of the Government; and I think a dismissal is appropriate. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Stone. MR. STONE: Your Honor, I don't think I have anything else to add. I think Mr. Beck accurately summarizes what occurred. THE COURT: One moment, gentlemen. I'm sure you heard the printer running up here, gentlemen. Ms. Fletcher, my law clerk here seated to my left, told me that there was some things that were just filed this

25 the Government this morning. And I'm going to take a moment to

morning by the Government, meaning some paperwork here filed by

```
1
    look at it. Have you all seen it?
              MR. STONE: Yes, Your Honor. We looked at it when we
 2
 3
    came in this morning.
             MR. BECK: Yes, Your Honor.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: Okay.
             MR. JACKSON: Your Honor, I can summarize what was
 6
 7
   filed. But if Your Honor --
              THE COURT: Don't you want me to read it?
 8
 9
             MR. JACKSON: Yes. Absolutely, Your Honor.
10
              THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Jackson, do you really want to
11
   interject yourself into this discussion considering the nature
12
   of it since it sounds like a plea that may or may not have been
13
   offered to Mr. Fairchild by Mr. Stein and hook yourself to that
14
   engine? And I'm just saying that because I try to look out for
15
   everybody.
16
             MR. JACKSON: I appreciate that very much, Your
17
   Honor. My office has a vested interest in this case along with
18
   the United States Attorney's Office. And as I am the only one
19
   familiar with the facts, who is nevertheless independent of
20
    that office, I was the only one in the position to make the
21
   motion that Your Honor is now reviewing.
2.2
              THE COURT: All right. Let me take a look at it
23
   then, gentlemen, if there's no objection by Mr. Stone or
   Mr. Beck.
24
25
             All right, gentlemen. Let's set aside Mr. Beck's
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

agreement.

motion to dismiss for the time being, and we'll address the Government's motion for a hearing. Mr. Jackson. MR. JACKSON: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. Obviously, under the local rules, I am not supposed to file independent of an attorney in the United States Attorney's Office for either the Northern or Southern District of West Virginia. And I filed this motion under the local rules that gives the Court the authority to make exceptions in the interest of justice. THE COURT: I would say this is an exception. Thank you, Your Honor. MR. JACKSON: THE COURT: So I'll hear you out on your motion. MR. JACKSON: Thank you. The Government believes that the remedy that the defendants have requested is a drastic remedy that is not called for under the prevailing authorities in the Fourth Circuit which made clear that the very draconian remedy of dismissal of the indictment should only be considered if there has been prejudice to the defendants that can't be cured by other means. And that of course is to vindicate the public's interest in determining the guilt or innocence of those who have been accused of crime. I think if Your Honor -- the reason why the Government has requested a hearing is to put the facts before this Court under oath by those individuals who are present with Mr. Fairchild and his attorney when he entered into a plea

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, the problem is, Mr. Jackson, that nothing any witness you would call to the stand at that hearing would change the fact, would it, that Mr. Stone and Mr. Beck were provided with a plea agreement that include the 5K term in it, and at no time until this witness was on the stand being cross examined did they hear that it was not on the table. They prepared their cross for this important material witness based upon that portion, in part, of the agreement and that cooperation as contained in the agreement, which was never corrected, was the very part or most of the part of their cross examination that they used to prove that he was not to be believed by the jury. That would completely -- if the jury decided to disbelieve this witness that would nearly completely undermine the credibility of that witness, would it not? And this plea agreement -- well, answer that question first. MR. JACKSON: Well, I think that would inure to the defendant's benefit if the jury were to disbelieve the testimony of the witness. THE COURT: But then that starts to ebb away at the Government's case to the defendant's advantage. Also that's a plea agreement and Giglio and Brady cover this; correct? MR. JACKSON: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: That the Government had an obligation to provide to counsel. Perhaps in no one's wildest dreams, because we couldn't really find a case on it, would we be in a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

```
situation like this where a plea agreement was provided to the
defendants of a key witness, but the terms in black and white
on the plea agreement were not the terms. At no time did the
Government contact Mr. Beck and Mr. Stone I imagine from the
discussion -- and tell me if I'm wrong, Mr. Beck and
Mr. Stone -- and say, hey, this 5K is not part of this
agreement. When is the first time you learned that, Mr. Beck?
         MR. BECK: When Mr. Stein made his objection, Your
Honor.
          THE COURT: Yesterday in the course of trial in the
middle of his witness's cross examination on the 5K?
         MR. BECK: That's correct, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: Mr. Stone?
         MR. STONE: Same here, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: All right. So that's the first they
heard of it. Never was that plea agreement corrected.
Mr. Manford filed not one but two joint motions to continue
Mr. Fairchild's sentencing on the basis that he had a 5K
agreement with the Government. Whether or not what Mr. Stein
told me was true, that he had the conversation with Mr. Manford
that Mr. Manford doesn't recall, whether or not that happened,
here's what's uncontested. The record was not corrected in
Mr. Fairchild's case. The defendants -- when it came, if you
believe Mr. Stein, to his attention that Mr. Manford thought
there was a 5K, presumably his client did as well.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Never when Mr. Stein says that came to his attention by the filing of the second motion -- and he had this conversation with Mr. Manford; not the first, the second -- never did he contact Mr. Beck and Mr. Stone and tell them that part of that plea agreement was incorrect. I didn't hear that so I presume it didn't happen. Never did he correct the record in Mr. Fairchild's case because what was told to the Court in those two motions that said they were joint motions was we have this 5K on the table.

Never was there an objection by the Government to that portion of Mr. Fairchild's PSR because I looked. And that PSR was filed January 25th -- I'm sorry, disclosed January 29, 2018. And never, even when Mr. Stein -- and I would hope he did -- prepared for the testimony of Mr. Fairchild, one of your key witnesses, I presume he would have then reviewed the plea agreement because you know sometimes you get stuck there on cooperation and everything else that you would have anticipated the defendants would use in his cross. Not even then were Mr. Stone and Mr. Beck told that this term they had before them in black and white on this plea agreement that had been around since January -- I'm sorry, November 29, 2017, never were they told paragraph 6 that doesn't apply even though the last paragraph -- I'll use Mr. Stein's words, boilerplate paragraph -- numbered paragraph in this plea agreement, even though that states these 16 paragraphs constitute the entire

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

agreement between the defendant and the United States of America in this matter. There are no agreements, understandings, or promises between the parties other than those contained in this agreement. How does anything Mr. Stein or any other witnesses you would call at a hearing change the fact that Mr. Stone and Mr. Beck in their preparation for the cross examination of Mr. Fairchild never knew that the 5K agreement was not an agreement since it was a term in this plea? How does anything Mr. Stein or any witness will tell me at a hearing change the fact that these two attorneys in preparation of their defense rely upon that? MR. JACKSON: Well, obviously nothing that the witnesses would say in a hearing would change what the defense attorneys relied on in their cross examination. However, it would put Mr. Stein's objection into what we think is its proper context. THE COURT: His speaking objection that he made while the witness was here on the stand and got tipped off to what was going on and his speaking objection that he made in front of this jury so the toothpaste, as I described it yesterday, was already out of the tube? I have racked my brain and invited counsel to tell me yesterday on how to cure this. don't know how to cure it. I can't find a cure.

MR. JACKSON: Well, Your Honor, I would say -- say a

few things. First, a 5K motion is always at the discretion of the United States Attorney's Office. So, yes, that provision is in the plea agreement; but it's also at the discretion of the Government whether the person who has signed that plea agreement receives that 5K.

Mr. Stein was -- his recollection of the circumstances under which that plea agreement was signed, as corroborated by the two agents who we would also call at any hearing, demonstrates that the witness knew that he would not qualify for a 5K. That is to say that the office had already exercised its discretion not to move for a 5K in his case.

THE COURT: I don't care what he knew. What I'm asking you is what did Mr. Beck and Mr. Stone know?

MR. JACKSON: So I --

2.2

THE COURT: And they didn't know that it was not part of this agreement. They weren't told. They presumed from everything, until Mr. Stein stood up and objected, made that speaking objection, that it was part of the agreement. How has this not affected their clients' rights? How does it not deprive their clients of a fair trial? And why is this -- I know Mr. Beck was very careful to avoid asking for a mistrial. But how is this not a ground for me to sua sponte, based on everything I've heard, declare a mistrial in this case? And if I declare a mistrial, double jeopardy attaches in this situation, and we won't be trying this case again.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
MR. JACKSON: The Government understands the very
serious nature of this issue which is why we filed this
pleading, Your Honor, and which is why we're making the rather
extraordinary request that we are to preserve the testimony for
the record. And I would just say that I am informed by
Mr. Stein that his course of dealing with the two defense
attorneys led him -- gave him the impression that they would
have understood that for this particular witness a 5K was
not -- it was not available. And that is -- that's why he made
the objection that he did.
          THE COURT: What do you mean his course of dealing?
         MR. JACKSON: His prior course of dealing with these
two defense counsel.
          THE COURT: Mr. Stone, how many cases have you had
with Mr. Stein?
         MR. STONE: Judge, I think Mr. Stein and I've tried
two cases. The Singh case and Ms. Myers' case. I believe he
was counsel on the appeal of another case.
          THE COURT: So you've only been involved in a case
that has been indicted how many times besides this one?
         MR. STONE:
                      I think I had the Singh case and --
          THE COURT:
                      I'm not talking about ones that got to
the appellate stage.
                      I'm talking about --
         MR. STONE:
                      I think two trial cases, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: Okay. How about you, Mr. Beck?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
MR. BECK: Your Honor, I've had two, perhaps three
cases with Mr. Stein. None have ever gone to trial. One of
them I was fired as a defense attorney. The other one was
dismissed. And I can't even recall -- I think -- to be honest
with you, I think there were three. None went to trial
however.
          THE COURT: So one was dismissed by the Government.
         MR. BECK: One was dismissed by Mr. Stein. One I was
fired.
          THE COURT: By your client on a court-appointed case?
         MR. BECK: Yeah. He actually accused me of trying to
kill him which is a long story but --
          THE COURT: Okay.
         MR. BECK: -- with Mr. Stein. And the other one I --
there could have been a third, but it didn't go to trial if it
was.
         THE COURT: Okay.
         MR. JACKSON: Your Honor, we would simply say that
the case law does show that dismissal of the indictment or a
mistrial after jeopardy has attached is obviously a very
drastic remedy. The Government would say that a curative
instruction would be sufficient in this case where what the
jury really saw was some confusion between whether this
particular witness was or was not eligible for a 5K1.1 motion
which the jury likely doesn't really even understand what that
```

is.

THE COURT: I'm not going to mislead the jury either because it didn't sound like Mr. Manford was confused. You didn't see his face. He was looking at me. Mr. Manford -- I don't know how many times Mr. Manford has appeared before me in court. So many I can't count. And I can tell you that I've tried equally as many cases as a prosecutor against Mr. Manford. I know from his facial expressions that he's thinking something. What he's thinking. You should have seen -- and I know when he's in difficult situations. There are times when he appears here where his client wants to say one thing that he doesn't quite believe, but he says my client wants me to tell you, Your Honor. And --

MR. JACKSON: I -- Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- when he was here, and I asked him pointed questions on whether he recalled the conversation he had with Mr. Stein, what he believed the terms of the plea to be, he struggled. And I don't know whether Mr. Beck and Mr. Stone, having worked with him umpteen times as well, saw it, but he struggled with trying not to throw Mr. Stein under the bus. I'll tell you now, I don't think in ruling on this -- on these motions I have to make a determination on who is telling the truth and who is not telling the truth. But now that we're here and I'm rethinking this, and I can see and hear, and I've reviewed the transcript from yesterday -- that

portion of it -- I can see and hear Mr. Manford telling me what the answers were to the questions I asked him, I can tell you that Mr. Manford doesn't recall having the conversation Mr. Stein had with him because it didn't happen.

MR. JACKSON: And, Your Honor, I am absolutely not saying Mr. Manford was being anything less than fully candid and forthright with this tribunal. I would have absolutely no basis for suggesting that. However, he was, according to the three witnesses that the Government would present, present when Mr. Fairchild was explained that he could not qualify for a 5K1.1 motion.

So I don't know what to make of that, Your Honor. I can only say to the Court that I have an assistant United States attorney and two federal agents who were all present with Mr. Fairchild and Mr. Manford during the time in which this plea agreement was negotiated and struck and executed which was very, very late at night. And they have informed me that it was very clearly delineated to Mr. Fairchild what his three options were. And, ultimately, he chose the second option which was standard cooperation without the benefit of a 5K in the presence of his attorney. That's why the Government requested the hearing, and that's the testimony that we would put on the record.

THE COURT: Well, let's -- okay. Then let's accept that as true. How does that change Mr. Beck's motion? Because

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

he thought there was a 5K based on what was in the plea agreement, in black and white, and prepared his cross examination of this witness based upon that. How does that change anything? And if it was that simple and it wasn't a term -- and Mr. Stein knew it wasn't a term when he put it in the agreement. He knew it wasn't a term when Mr. Manford filed two -- not one, but two motions to continue with the 5K as the basis for the continuance. When he saw Fairchild's PSR and didn't object to it because it says it was a term. Why didn't he ever think, holy smokes, I'm going to trial on Reba Myers and Ms. Lindquist's case. I better tell Mr. Stone and Mr. Beck that what is written in black and white is misleading because this is Giglio. I got to fix it. He didn't. So how does anything that your agents or Mr. Stein could say to me in a separate hearing on this case, belaboring this proceeding, how can anything they have to say change what happened with regard to how Mr. Beck and Mr. Stone saw it and how they prepared their clients' defense and how their clients may or may not have been in a position where now they're not having a fair trial? MR. JACKSON: I mean I think it would go to show whether there was actually misconduct or --THE COURT: Well, maybe that's an issue for the ethics folks down in Charleston really because I -- how does anything that happened on the Government's end have anything to do with what Mr. Stone and Mr. Beck were proceeding on in the course of their preparation for trial because they had it in black and white and no one corrected it?

2.2

MR. JACKSON: Your Honor, you are correct that nothing that would happen at a hearing would change what has already occurred. These would be the cross examination that the defense counsel prepared of Mr. Fairchild.

THE COURT: So I can just accept your proffer for the purposes of this hearing; correct?

MR. JACKSON: You could. I think that because of the nature of this motion and what defense counsel has essentially, you know, accused the Government of doing, I know that the folks at this table want the opportunity to be heard and to have that for the record. Their testimony preserved for the record. That's part of why we made this request.

THE COURT: Quite frankly, maybe Mr. Stein doesn't want to testify in this proceeding about this issue and conversations had and not had and what's boilerplate in plea agreements and not, particularly since Mr. Beck has already told me one thing he said yesterday was inaccurate based upon what Mr. Beck learned as an officer of the Court from the public defender down in the Southern District. I really don't think that's wise anyway. But let me hear from Mr. Beck and Mr. Stone about your motion, and then I'll address it.

MR. BECK: Your Honor, I don't know if I can add any

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

```
more to it. I don't think anything they would say would change
the equation here. We're still in the same pickle. And,
again, I -- as I said yesterday, there's two options. A
dismissal for government misconduct or a mistrial, which we're
not asking for, but the Court sua sponte could do that.
all I can say about it, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: Mr. Stone.
         MR. STONE: I don't have anything to add, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: Anything further on your motion,
Mr. Jackson?
          MR. JACKSON: The only thing that I would add is that
at the time that this plea agreement was negotiated, this was a
case in the Northern District of West Virginia. And I am
informed that the policy of that office is that the defendant
and the position that Mr. Fairchild was in would not qualify
under any circumstances for a 5K1.1 motion. I can't speak to
what the Southern District of West Virginia does except to say
that I'm told that they have a similar practice even if it is
not a matter of policy there.
          THE COURT: But technically testimony alone would
qualify; correct? I'm not talking about the inner workings of
the decisions of how the Government in the Northern District of
West Virginia decides how they're going to file the motion or
not file the motion. I'm asking you technically.
         MR. JACKSON: And I --
```

```
THE COURT: Testimony alone would qualify.
 1
             MR. JACKSON: Would qualify as -- I'm sorry --
 2
 3
              THE COURT: A 5K. If someone -- if the Government
 4
    files a 5K motion in front of me --
              MR. JACKSON: Your Honor, it --
 5
              THE COURT: -- that would qualify --
 6
 7
              MR. JACKSON: It could, yes, because it's always in
    the discretion of the United States Attorney's Office what
 8
 9
    qualifies. It is in the Government's --
10
              THE COURT: Right.
11
             MR. JACKSON: -- sole discretion.
12
              THE COURT: But what I -- because what Mr. Stone
13
   basically said to this -- Stein said to this jury was he's not
14
   eligible for a 5K. And they would have assumed that meant he
15
   could never get it. That's an interpretation they could make.
16
   Technically, testimony alone would enable me, if the motion was
    filed based on testimony alone, to grant it; correct?
17
18
             MR. JACKSON: Yes.
19
              THE COURT: Okay. Anything further on your motion?
20
             MR. JACKSON: No, Your Honor.
21
              THE COURT: Thank you. Let me ask you something
2.2
   else, Mr. Jackson. Mr. Stein told us up here at sidebar that
23
   that 5K paragraph is boilerplate in the plea agreements, the
24
   written plea agreements, but it doesn't mean anything in some
25
   of these cases. Is that true?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

```
MR. JACKSON: I don't know whether it's -- I do not
   know whether it is boilerplate or not although --
              THE COURT: Okay. Then let me ask you this. It was
   put in this one, and it was put in this one, but it was
   meaningless; correct? No, Mr. Stein, I'm asking a question.
   It was put in this one, but it was meaningless is what you're
   telling me?
             MR. JACKSON: No, Your Honor. And we explained in
   our pleading that plea agreement was already drafted and was in
   hand at the time they confronted Mr. Fairchild at the West
   Virginia State Police Barracks.
              THE COURT: Did anybody have a pen that they could
   have just crossed it out?
             MR. JACKSON: Of course, Your Honor. But because of
   the very late hour and because of the fact that everybody had
    talked about what was on the table for Mr. Fairchild, and they
   thought that they had reached an understanding, nobody thought
    to cross it out.
              THE COURT: We have a lawyer here, a defense lawyer
   named Sherman Lambert, and if he were in this courtroom, his
   response to that would be sloppy. And he would have said that
22
   word in about four syllables.
             MR. JACKSON: I can't defend leaving a provision in a
24
   plea agreement that was not going to be ever operational.
25
   Nevertheless --
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE COURT: Can you -- and can you defend leaving that in a plea agreement that you hand over as is your obligation? You're duty bound to hand it over to defense counsel before trial. Can you defend that? MR. JACKSON: Well, obviously, the plea agreement was produced as was the Government's responsibility. The -- I think the -- it certainly would have been a better practice to have -- to have informed defense counsel that that 5K was not available to Mr. Fairchild. THE COURT: And if I understand what you're telling me your witnesses would say, is that this paragraph 6, which talks about the 5K, that there was really never any consideration by the United States to ever make that motion in this case. So it was part of this written plea agreement, but the Government never had any intention of filing that motion going into this at the time the plea agreement was signed. MR. JACKSON: Yes because the plea agreement makes clear that it is only in the discretion of the United States Attorney's Office. THE COURT: But -- but, even though it makes clear it was in their discretion, they never even planned to consider it. MR. JACKSON: They had already exercised their discretion. They had already decided they weren't THE COURT:

```
1
   going to -- they had already decided they weren't going to ever
   file a 5K motion in Mr. Fairchild's case at the time
 2
   Mr. Fairchild signed this plea agreement.
 3
 4
             MR. JACKSON: I believe that's correct although
   presumably there's always a possibility that a cooperating
 5
   defendant could do something additional that would then qualify
 6
 7
   him for that. I don't think that's --
              THE COURT: Well, Mr. Stein told us the only way he
 8
   could have done it was to have worn a wire yesterday and made
 9
10
    some buys like in a drug case.
11
              MR. JACKSON: I understand that. The reason why that
12
   was even contemplated with Mr. Fairchild was because it was
13
   thought that he was in a position to help the authorities in
   New York against an organized crime figure, and that is the
14
15
   basis for which he would have been eligible to receive the
16
    5K1.1.
17
              THE COURT: But Mr. Stein told us yesterday, and he
   told me in front of this jury, and he told me several times he
18
19
   was never eligible for it. So it's kind of different.
20
   never heard about New York yesterday. Right?
              MR. JACKSON: Yes, Your Honor.
21
                                              I think that
22
   obviously we didn't go into all the facts and circumstances
23
    surrounding Mr. Fairchild's plea agreement yesterday.
24
              THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
25
              There is nothing that I can hear further from
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Stein or any of the case agents in this case that would change what happened on the end for the defense and these defendants. I can accept what you have told me here today as a proper -- I'm sorry, as a proffer, Mr. Jackson; and since I'm accepting it as a proffer, and I don't see how it would change anything related to Mr. Beck's motion, then I'm going to deny the request for a hearing by the Government. We'll note the Government's exception to it. Mr. Stone, you said with regard to Mr. Beck's motion, you have nothing further to add or do you? MR. STONE: Judge, no -- I mean we join it, but, you know, I understand the recitations and representations made by Mr. Jackson; but we had that bench conference and counsel for Mr. Fairchild stated his understanding. And based upon the representations of Mr. Fairchild's counsel, the represent -his understanding was Mr. Fairchild was eligible for a 5K based upon both grand jury and trial testimony. And he definitely seemed to be shocked to be learning at that bench conference, while his client was on the stand, that now he wasn't eligible for a 5K. So, you know, that's something that's not controverted.

So, you know, regardless of what Mr. Stein and the agents may recall -- and I mean clearly, you know, probably the better way to have handled it was to object and have a bench conference, but all of this was blurted out to the jury. And

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
it -- you know, it really casts I believe Mr. Beck in a
negative light in front of the jury for in a sense trying to
create the inference that somehow he was trying to mislead the
jury. And, again, as Mr. Beck said, upon reflection, I'm not
really sure how you can cure that.
          THE COURT: At the stage we are now, does the fact --
let's -- I won't use the word fact. Let's say that
Mr. Fairchild did understand, even though it sounds like his
attorney didn't, that he -- so I don't know how he understood
it and his attorney didn't. Let's say Mr. Fairchild understood
5K -- possibility of 5K motion was not on the table. Does that
change anything on your end, Mr. Stone or Mr. Beck? And I'll
hear from you first, Mr. Stone, since you're standing.
         MR. STONE: I don't believe so, Your Honor. We --
again, I crossed him with the understanding that he was
eligible for a 5K and hoped to obtain a benefit from his
testimony. I brought it up. I -- there wasn't an objection
during my cross.
          THE COURT: That's what I wonder. Why wasn't --
Mr. Jackson, why wasn't there an objection during Mr. Stone's
cross?
         MR. JACKSON: Your Honor, I think the United States
always tries to make objections only when we think that it
might really have an impact and also there's times when you
just don't object even if something is objectionable. And I
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

think it wasn't until Mr. Beck had gone over this territory again, and it appeared to Mr. Stein that it was mischaracterizing the nature of the agreement that the United States had. Not based on the language of the plea agreement but just based on his own recollection of what the agreement was and that Mr. Fairchild had testified consistent with what the agreement actually was. That that's when we chose to object. THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Stone. MR. STONE: Judge, again -- I mean, again, it creates the inference that, you know, these defense lawyers are just trying to, you know, pull the wool over our eyes. And, again, I don't know if Mr. Stein just kind of lost his temper, wasn't thinking, but it was all blurted out for all to hear. And I mean I just -- clearly it was improper and it's prejudicial. And it's -- again, that's inconsistent with the documents we were provided. I mean obviously if I had known that Fairchild is not eliqible for a 5K, I probably wouldn't have asked him about it because it wouldn't have made any sense to even ask him about it. THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Stone. Mr. Jackson. MR. JACKSON: Your Honor, I think the important thing for the jury to know is that the witness would receive a benefit in exchange for his testimony before this Court. they heard that. And he testified that he was hoping to get

some benefit out of what he was here doing today. That ultimately -- the jury ultimately understands I think from everything that happened that Mr. Fairchild is a Government cooperating witness and that he -- and that they can take that fact into consideration when they decide what weight to give to his testimony. The -- I don't think that the prejudice that has occurred to -- from defense counsel asking some questions about a 5K is so significant to warrant the very drastic remedy of dismissal of the indictment.

THE COURT: Mr. Beck.

2.2

MR. BECK: Your Honor, I would just say by virtue of the objection being made in the presence of Mr. Fairchild, he knows exactly what to say now. He's going to pair it to what Mr. Stein said. And the problem with that is you have -- and I believe now becomes Brady -- two motions that Mr. Stein joined in to grant him a 5 -- to possibly grant him a 5K1 motion. Then all that has to come in, and the jury is going to be sitting there saying what is going on here. That's why I just don't think it can be fixed, Your Honor. That cat is out of the bag. It's gone off the rails. And it's the Government's fault for whatever reason. Something has to be done. I think either dismissal based on our motion or the Court exercising its own discretion.

THE COURT: All right, counsel. We all know or we should know that the Government is duty bound, pursuant to

Giglio, to turn over a plea agreement; correct? Especially where a witness's testimony is integral to the case. So evidence of any understanding or agreement as to a witness's prosecution is relevant to his credibility, and the jury is entitled to know it. The Government has an affirmative duty to produce evidence which is materially favorable to the accused, in this case, Ms. Lindquist and Ms. Myers, either as direct or impeaching evidence. And this is the scenario in which this arose. Impeaching evidence of a key Government witness. The existence of an agreement between the witness who has the plea agreement with the Government is absolutely material to the defendant's case. And I find that it is here.

Regardless of the Government's attorney's intent -I'm not saying that Mr. Stein did anything intentional here.
But whether it's intentional or unintentional, the failure to disclose a plea agreement, and it goes without saying then a term of a plea agreement -- in this case, the negative of a term that was in this plea agreement in black and white -- violates the due process clause. We've got this layer of Giglio and Brady through this issue and this motion raised by Mr. Beck. This term of this plea agreement, which Mr. Beck and Mr. Stone relied upon, was withheld in the reverse because it's in the plea agreement, and they relied upon it in their preparation of their clients' defense. Yet I'm being told it was not part of the agreement.

I find that there's a reasonable probability in this case that at this point, the outcome would be different in this case having now learned that one side, the Government, is disputing this term of the plea agreement which is in their own agreement that they prepared.

I can't see -- I can't see how to cure this because I find there's a reasonable probability that the outcome of this case would be different if the jury listens and considers what Mr. Stone and Mr. Beck put forward before them with regard to the 5K as opposed to whether now we try to suck it back and put it under the rug. I don't think there's any way we can do that nor have I heard any way we can do that.

And I don't have to get into a discussion of what's true or what's not true with regard to what Mr. Stein told me and what Mr. Manford told me with regard to these disagreements, including whether Mr. Manford was told at some point after his — at the time of or after his client signed the plea agreement that the 5K wasn't on the table, what discussions the Government had with Mr. Fairchild. My focus is on what the lawyers in this case don't dispute. And this is what no one disputes because it's irrefutable. This plea agreement was turned over to Mr. Stone and Mr. Beck. The plea agreement of Mr. Fairchild. About when was this plea agreement that was signed November 29, 2017, provided to you? Mr. Beck or Mr. Stone?

```
1
             MR. STONE: Judge, I think we got it through a PACER
 2
   notification. I think it was -- I think we got it that way.
 3
              THE COURT: About how long ago?
 4
             MR. STONE: Shortly --
             MR. BECK: Many months ago, Your Honor.
 5
             MR. STONE: Yeah.
 6
 7
             MR. BECK: It was early on in discovery.
 8
             MR. STONE: Right.
 9
              THE COURT: So it was provided to you on PACER
10
   because it came up because he was a codefendant in this --
11
             MR. STONE: Yeah, I think December --
12
              THE COURT: -- case?
13
             MR. STONE: December of 2017.
14
              THE COURT: Okay. So you got it because you were
15
   attorneys of record in the case as a whole?
16
             MR. STONE: I think we got that -- it might have been
17
   part of -- I can't identify -- there were so many documents
18
    disclosed, Judge. I can't say what --
19
              THE COURT: Okay. So it was around December --
20
             MR. STONE: Right.
21
              THE COURT: -- of 2017. Is that your best
2.2
   recollection, Mr. Beck?
23
             MR. BECK: That's right, Your Honor. I agree.
24
              THE COURT: Okay. In black and white in this
25
   document, signed by Mr. Fairchild and Mr. Manford on each and
```

every page, in paragraph number 6, this plea reads, "If, in the sole opinion of the United States Attorney, the defendant has provided substantial assistance in the investigation or prosecution of another person who has committed an offense, the Government will file a Section 5K1.1 motion for a sentencing quidelines reduction."

Paragraph 16 states, "These 16 paragraphs constitute the entire agreement between the defendant and the United States of America in this matter. There are no agreements, understandings, or promises between the parties other than those contained in this agreement."

Mr. Stein signed this agreement, and the signature is right under paragraph 16.

No attorney, much less a reasonable attorney, would not rely upon the terms that are set forth in black and white in this written plea agreement in preparing for the cross examination of a key witness against their client. At no time did the Government tell Mr. Stone or Mr. Beck that paragraph 6 was not part of the agreement. The first they heard of it was in the middle of Mr. Fairchild's cross examination on the stand. But it wasn't in the middle of Mr. Beck's cross examination of Mr. Fairchild. He went second. I'm sorry. It wasn't in the cross examination of Mr. — in Mr. — it wasn't in Mr. Stone's cross examination of Mr. Fairchild. He went first. It arose during Mr. Beck's cross examination of

Mr. Fairchild. Mr. Beck went second.

2.2

Then there were two motions to continue filed by Mr. Manford in this case to continue Mr. Faircloth's sentencing. One was filed in April of 2018 moving to continue Mr. Fairchild's April 16, 2018, sentencing. And in it Mr. Manford states the basis for the motion is the 5K1 and his client's anticipated testimony at Ms. Myers' and Ms. Lindquist's trial, and it states the Government joins in the motion.

Again, Mr. Manford filed a second motion to continue in August 2018 moving to continue the August 20, 2018, sentencing of his client on the same basis as the first and states that the Government joined in the motion. It doesn't say Government did not oppose which we often see. It says Government joins in the motion.

Mr. Stein told us when we were talking about the second motion here yesterday that he realized and called Mr. Manford and told him the 5K was not on the table at that time. Mr. Manford doesn't recall the conversation. But if as early as August 2018 Mr. Stein realized that the 5K was thought by Mr. Manford to be part of the plea, he didn't let Mr. Stone or Mr. Beck know that it wasn't part of the plea then or any time thereafter; and he didn't correct the record with regard to the first or second motion.

It doesn't look like there was any motion to seal

```
1
   these two motions, Mr. Beck and Mr. Stone. Did you receive
    them as part of just a regular CME/CF?
 2
 3
             MR. BECK: No, Your Honor.
             MR. STONE: No, Your Honor.
 4
              THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Fletcher tells me she checked
 5
    just now. That they were sealed. All right.
 6
 7
              There also weren't any objections to the portion of
   Mr. Fairchild's PSR where it was noted in paragraph 29 -- and
 8
   that PSR was filed January 29, 2018 -- there weren't any
 9
10
   objections by the Government to that paragraph stating there
11
   was a 5K1 component to the plea agreement. And I would have
12
   presumed when prepping for this witness's, Mr. Fairchild's,
13
   testimony, the Government would have had the plea agreement
   there before them and anything else that may come up during the
14
15
   course of Mr. Fairchild -- I'm sorry, during the course of
16
   Mr. Fairchild's testimony, and yet Mr. Stein didn't alert
17
   Mr. Stone or Mr. Beck to this either. And I'm sorry I keep
18
   switching back between Faircloth and Fairchild. It is
19
   Mr. Fairchild. The motions have John Barrat Faircloth on them
20
    that Mr. Manford filed in Mr. Fairchild's case, but it is
21
   Fairchild. Correct, counsel?
22
             MR. BECK: That's right, Your Honor.
23
             MR. STONE: Yes, Your Honor.
24
              THE COURT: All right. So the first Mr. Beck and
25
   Mr. Stone learned that Mr. Stein was asserting before this jury
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that the 5K was not part of the agreement with Mr. Fairchild and that Mr. Fairchild, in his words, was not eligible for the 5k -- and I don't want to misquote him so let me make sure I've got it correct.

Mr. Stein said -- objected and said mischaracterizing the cooperation of the agreement -- Mr. Beck was -- and that he's talking about a 5K1, and this witness is not eligible for a 5K and can never get a 5K. So that he, referring to Mr. Beck, is suggesting and the witness doesn't know what he's talking about so the witness has said he doesn't know and in the end, it's up to the Court. That's his understanding. And Mr. Stein went on, in response to a question by the Court of why it's in the plea agreement if the witness wasn't eligible, to say the 5K, it's a boilerplate agreement. That the option is open if he earns it. In this case, you have to do several things to earn a 5K which involves a level of cooperation that this witness is not capable of; and, therefore, he's not eligible to get a 5K1. The United States attorney will not recommend a 5K1. He's never been promised a 5K. And the witness is not mischaracterizing his testimony. testifying to what it is. And for Mr. Beck to keep coming back and saying the Government has agreed to do this for you, it's a may, if in the discretion of the Unites States, he's qualified for 5K, and he can't qualify for 5K.

So the first, Mr. Stone and Mr. Beck -- and this

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Court because I read all of this that I have before me in preparation for this trial too -- the first we heard of this was when Mr. Stein stood up and made that speaking objection before the witness on the stand and before the jury in this box to my right. And that very well could have tipped off the witness to where his testimony needed to be going. And Mr. Stein's attempt to correct Mr. Beck made it look to this jury that Mr. Beck was mistaken. And most importantly, it pulled the rug out from the preparation for the testimony of this material witness by Mr. Stone and Mr. Beck because that line of questioning goes to the real heart of the credibility of that witness because it goes to his motivation to lie in a big way because he would be receiving a benefit from the Government. And not a benefit as far as, oh, I testified. did a good thing, and the Government is going to move for the Court to be more lenient because of that in my sentencing. a bigger way because the starting point under the guidelines for the Court to sentence this witness would be lower if he received several levels of a reduction by the Court in the calculation of his guideline range if the Court had granted a 5K motion by the Government. These defendants were prejudiced in their preparation of their defense in relying upon what they received from the Government with regard to what the deal was on paper in black

and white, never disputed or clarified or corrected for them.

It was detrimental to the preparation of their defense.

There's no way to cure this *Giglio* and *Brady* problem that has been presented to this Court in this case involving the agreement the Government had with Mr. Faircloth and how it played out in the course of this trial. I don't take declaring mistrials lightly. My hope is that all these trials, if they can and there's sufficient evidence to present to the jury, go to the jury and for them to consider all the evidence presented and the law and figure it out for themselves. But we have a case here where an inaccurate -- if we believe what Mr. Stein has told us -- an inaccurate plea agreement was provided to Mr. Stone and Mr. Beck, and it interfered with their preparation of effective cross examination of an important Government witness in this case.

And after Mr. Stone's initial cross examination with regard to the 5K, which did not draw an objection, and then in the middle of Mr. Beck's discussion of this 5K with this material Government witness, the Government made a standing objection interjecting that 5K was not part of the agreement and was never considered by the Government. And they would make a motion, and this witness on the stand was not eligible. That seriously interfered with the defendant's examination of this key witness and goes to the very heart, as I've said, to his credibility. There's no curative instruction to fix that.

The prosecutor's remarks are one thing. The

prosecutor's conduct in providing this written plea agreement to Mr. Stone and Mr. Beck, which they relied upon to the very middle of Mr. Fairchild's cross examination, that conduct was improper. They should have been told before they prepared their defense that this term was not part of the agreement if that, in fact, was true. That conduct prejudicially affected each of these defendants', Ms. Myers and Ms. Lindquist, substantial rights and deprived them of a fair trial.

I'm not saying that Mr. Stein's inactions were intentional. The result of the conduct is the same, however, and the effect upon these defendants' rights is the same. Absent those remarks with regard to the 5K not being on the table, the jury could have made the determination that this witness was not telling the truth and that absolutely would have affected the strength of the defense in this case and absolutely would have affected proof of establishing the defendants' guilt in this case.

And as I stated, I can't think of any curative instruction and have not been presented with any curative instruction that I can determine would fix this. And I don't think, and I so find, that in declaring a mistrial sua sponte, which is what I'm doing at this point on the basis that I've placed upon the record, this case can't be tried again. These defendants, through no wrong of their own or their attorneys, have been deprived of the right to have their trial completed

by a particular tribunal and that's this jury that we've had here for four days, going on five days of trial.

As a matter of manifest necessity, I am sua sponte declaring a mistrial in this case. Double jeopardy attaches, and we will not try this case again.

I'll note the exception of the Government to the Court's ruling here today.

We owe it to this jury who changed business plans — one of which changed business plans to continue their duty as a citizen to serve on this jury and another who has changed an operation to serve and perform their civic duty, to bring them out here and tell them that the Court has decided on a matter of legal significance discussed among counsel that a mistrial must be declared and that their work here is finished. But I think we owe it to them to tell them that. Particularly, since we've had them back there for quite a while while we discussed this important issue.

And I will say, counsel, I don't take this decision lightly. I have agonized and belabored over this all evening and preparing with this and researching this issue with my clerks. And I have come to the only decision that's appropriate based upon what I've been presented in this case. And it gives me no pleasure to make this decision, particularly under the circumstances with which it arose.

We'll go ahead and bring our jury out.

(The jury returned to open court at 9:53 A.M.)

THE COURT: Have a seat, ladies and gentlemen. Good morning and welcome back. I know, you know, we broke a little earlier than we anticipated yesterday, and we had you back there for a while this morning before we brought you out here.

I know that you all have been very attentive during the course of this trial. We had one juror who changed some business plans to make sure he could continue performing his civic duty and finish this through to verdict. We had another juror who moved around an operation so she could perform her part. And that's commendable. We don't always have jurors who are trying to complete their service. Sometimes and probably in each case there's someone who just doesn't want to be here. I know we've got a teacher who has been away from her class as well and other folks who have jobs and family obligations. So I appreciate the service that you have performed here in this case. Everyone took it very seriously.

We broke early yesterday because an issue arose that the Court and counsel needed to discuss which would change the procedural direction of this case. It was significant and important enough that we recessed for the evening to do some more research and consider the discussion that was had here on the record after you left for the day. And after considering the arguments of counsel and the circumstances under which the issue arose, I have determined sua sponte to declare a mistrial

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

155

in this case. The outcome of this means that considering the law as I viewed it and the circumstances, double jeopardy attaches and, therefore, these defendants won't be tried again. Ordinarily, we would get to your being able to decide this case and your word being the final resolution of this case. During the course of my instructions to you, I would tell you that even though I'd instructed you throughout the trial not to discuss the case among yourselves or with anyone else, you can discuss the case with yourselves or anyone else with whom you choose to discuss it. However, no one can contact you. Not the lawyers, not their clients, or anyone else and ask you any questions about the case unless the Court permits them to. So in other words, you're free to talk about it on your own, but no one can contact you and require you to talk to it -- to talk to them about it. Okay. So I thought I'd let you know that. So your duty here is different than a grand jury. A grand jury can never talk about the proceedings. You all are fine. Because I know that a lot of jurors find their service interesting, and the case is interesting, and after the fact, they like to discuss it with their husband or their wife or their family. And that's just fine. Any comments for us or questions before we let you Yes, ma'am. go?

JUROR: Since this is my third month, this will mean

```
1
   after today I will no longer get summonsed for this three-month
   period; correct?
 2
 3
              THE COURT: I always confuse that with when I was a
 4
    judge in circuit court so we'll let Mr. Mullen, who is the
   expert, let you know.
 5
              THE CLERK: You should be completed. Your service.
 6
 7
              JUROR: All right. Thank you.
              THE COURT: Okay. That's everyone.
 8
 9
              THE CLERK: Uh-huh.
10
              JUROR: Okay.
11
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. I know we've got
12
   Thanksgiving and Christmas coming up. You all have a great
13
   holiday season. And thank you so much for your service.
14
    sorry for you that you didn't get to be the final answer on
15
   this case. Thank you.
16
              (The jury was excused from the courtroom.)
17
              THE COURT: Our jury has exited the courtroom.
18
   Please be seated, counsel.
19
              I'm going to direct the clerk to make an entry in the
20
    court file that Mr. Beck's motion has been mooted by virtue of
   the Court's sua sponte declaring a mistrial in this case.
21
2.2
   will note the exception. He'll note the exception of the
   Government. We'll include the Court's ruling on the
23
24
   Government's motion that was made this morning as well.
2.5
   don't want to enter a paper order. I think my findings were
```

```
1
    comprehensive on the record because a written order out there
    on the court docket would end up being yet another piece of
 2
 3
    paper that could get into the wrong hands about a witness's
 4
    cooperation. So we'll just leave it at that.
              Mr. Jackson.
 5
              MR. JACKSON: Yes, Your Honor. Just a point of
 6
 7
    clarification. The -- I understand the Court then granted our
    special motion for leave to file in opposition?
 8
 9
              THE COURT: Yes.
10
              MR. JACKSON: Does that then become part of the
    record in this case?
11
12
              THE COURT: Yes. Yes. Absolutely.
13
              MR. JACKSON:
                            Thank you, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: You're welcome.
14
15
              Anything further on behalf of your client, Mr. Stone?
16
              MR. STONE: No, Your Honor.
17
              THE COURT: Mr. Beck?
18
              MR. BECK: No, thank you, Your Honor.
19
              THE COURT: All right. The bailiffs or CSOs are
20
    going to make sure that nobody leaves the courthouse until the
21
    jury has exited. And I will remand Ms. Myers to the custody of
2.2
    the United States Marshals.
23
24
              (Court adjourned at 10:00 A.M.)
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I, Kate A. Slayden, Registered Professional Reporter and Official Court Reporter of the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of an excerpt of the proceedings had in the above-styled action on November 8, 2018 and November 9, 2018, as reported by me.

I certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Given under my hand this 28th day of November 2018.

/s/Kate A. Slayden

Kate A. Slayden, RPR Official Reporter, United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia

2.2